

The
American Historical Review

THE FRENCH REFORMATION AND THE FRENCH
PEOPLE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

THE Reformation had the two-fold character of a social and of a religious revolution. It was not solely against doctrinal corruptions and against ecclesiastical abuses, but also against misery and iniquity that the lower classes rebelled; they sought in the Bible not only for the doctrine of salvation by grace, but for proofs of the primitive equality of all men.

“When Adam delved and Eve span
Who was then the gentleman?”

In Germany the works of Janssen have shown the immense part played in the Reformation by the peasants' revolts. It was poor Conrad, “der arme Kunz,” who gave the victory to Luther, despite the anathema which the Saxon monk pronounced upon that troublesome ally. In England it is a commonplace to say with Thorold Rogers that the strength of the Reformation was due “to the secret Lollardry, which seemed to be extinguished and was so active,” and that “the Puritan movement was essentially and originally one of the middle classes, of the traders in the towns, of the farmers in the country.”¹

I.

Did matters take another course in France? Our historians usually see in the Huguenot party above all else a party of noblemen. They think that the aristocracy preferred the rigidity of Protestantism to the pomp of the Roman Church; and that if the new religion did not triumph in France, it was because it could get no hold upon the popular classes.² Yet Michelet had said: “In the

¹ *The Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 84. See also Taine, *Hist. de la Littérature Anglaise*, II. 301.

² Aug. Thierry, *Hist. du Tiers État*, p. III. Mignet, *Essais*, pp. 256-262.

sixteenth century at Meaux . . . was kindled the first spark in the religious revolution."¹ He observed also that in Crespin's martyrology one finds "but three nobles in forty years (1515-1555); . . . the others are generally poor workmen, burgesses and merchants."² An American writer, who has thrown a vivid light upon this portion of French history, Professor Henry M. Baird, remarked more recently that Louis de Berquin, executed so late as 1528, was the first in date, amongst the "martyrs," who was a "man of quality."³ He mentions the indignant surprise shown by Henry II. in 1558 on hearing that the Chastillons, who belonged to the aristocracy, had embraced a religion fit only for low people.⁴ In 1561, the Venetian envoy Giovanni Michiel wrote: "Till now, owing to the severity of the tortures, none have been seen to come forward but common people who, besides their lives, had not much to lose" . . .⁵ Does not the Catholic historian Florimond Raemond say that the first adherents of the new doctrine were "a few poor, simple men, . . . working men," and "even such as had never done aught but handle the plough and dig the ground?"⁶ He rails with bitter irony at those men of low degree, ignorant, illiterate, who "at a moment's notice become excellent theologians." But is not this very banter an involuntary admission of the fact that amongst these "wretched penny-earners" the Reformation found its first partisans?

An indirect proof of this affirmation lies in the very means which the new doctrine employed in its propagation. If its hold had been merely upon a public composed of men of letters and scholars it would have continued to publish long tracts in Latin, as Le Febvre d'Étaples had begun to do. Had it relied for support mainly upon the nobility it would have spoken in its sermons and books the polished language of the court. Now, what do we see in fact? As early as 1525 the bishop of Meaux is reproached for having distributed in his diocese "books in French which were all error and heresy."⁷ The translation of the Bible happening to be one of them, these early heretics obtained the nickname of "Biblians." We find, too, an ever-increasing number of pamphlets for the people, such as "*Alphabets for the simple and rude*,"⁸ wherein, under pretext of

¹ *Histoire de France* (ed. 1876), X. 155.

² *Ibid.*, p. 337; and XI. 74, 78.

³ *History of the Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 318.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti in Francia*, III. 425.

⁶ *Histoire...de l'Hérésie de ce Siècle*, Rouen, 1623, pp. 845, 851, 871-873.

⁷ S. Berger, *Procès de Briçonnet* (in *Bulletin Historique du Protestantisme Français*, 15 jan., 1895).

⁸ *Alphabet ou Institution Chrestienne* . . . Lyons, 1558.

teaching the children the rudiments of reading, they are initiated into the doctrine of grace; translations of the minor tracts of Luther;¹ collections of Protestant prayers. Thousands of these little books were issued by the clandestine presses of Meaux and Alençon, by the Protestant presses of Lyons and Geneva. Although they were not infrequently burned with their owners, many of them are to be found in our libraries. These little books found their way into the peddler's pack, under the trinkets and sweets, and were thus circulated from village to village; more than one peddler paid with his life for the guilt of having transported those forbidden wares. In a barn, at night, by the dim light of the candle—for they must not raise suspicion—or by daylight in the forest glade, at the "*école buissonnière*," the illiterate gathered around him who could read. He was a vicar or a monk, brought over to the new ideas, or sometimes a schoolmaster or a lawyer, barrister, proctor or notary; he would read, and around him hardheaded peasants, the women that span, the children with large, wondering eyes, muttered inwardly the strong words of the Bible, or the exhortations of the theologian; from that day, in some obscure corner of "the most Christian Kingdom," a Protestant community was born.

But the book is not enough for the popular mind; the people in France are fond of singing while they work. All those who were unable to read—and such was then the case with nearly all Frenchmen of the lower classes—would ponder within themselves on what they had heard read by the learned man of the village or of their quarter of the town. All day long, while driving the plough "o'er the furrowed land" or throwing the shuttle at the loom, they would repeat over again, under their breath, the words that had most deeply impressed them; those words caught the very rhythm of their labor, and a song would shape itself upon their lips. The existence of a vast literature of Huguenot songs would alone suffice to prove the existence of a popular Protestantism; for those songs, such are their words, style and rhythm, can only have been written for the common people and sung by them.²

How is it that the contrary opinion still prevails? Why is the statement constantly repeated in France that the French Reformation was an aristocratic movement? At most it is conceded—because it is too strikingly obvious to be denied—that the burghers of the towns, the lawyers and the masters of crafts played an important part in it. But why is the part played by the popular classes ignored? There are three reasons:

¹Weiss, *Bull. du Protest. Franç.*, 1887, p. 664; 1888, pp. 155, 432, 500.

²Bordier, *Chansonnier Huguenot*, I. pp. xiv, xxviii; Montaiglon, *Recueil des Poésies Françaises*; Le Roux de Lincy, *Chants Historiques Français*.

First, it is usual to study the Reformation after 1560 only, at the time, that is, when it almost ceases to be a religious revolution and becomes a political party; and then, indeed, it is, so to speak, captured by the gentry;

Secondly, the Catholics are loath to recognize in the French Reformation a popular movement, for to do so would invest it with additional importance, would amount to a confession that it was deeply rooted in the national soil, and would make it in the future impossible to regard it as a foreign importation, a superficial or factitious growth;

Thirdly, the Protestants are upon this point at one with the Catholics,¹ for a kind of shame hinders them from conceding that the Reformation was a social revolution; they would see in it a purely intellectual, spiritual movement; they put aside all the impure, blind, violent, sometimes criminal elements which the intervention of the mob introduces into every revolution; in their view, ideas alone were at work in the Reformation, the interests and passions had no part.

II.

M. Hanotaux, after studying in his well-known *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu* the social state of the French workmen at the beginning of the seventeenth century, notes with perfect justice "the rapidity with which the working classes gave in their adherence to the Reformation."² It is, indeed, in the situation of this class that we shall find the cause of its attitude towards the religious innovations.

That situation was by no means enviable. The discovery of gold and silver mines, increasing considerably the stock of the precious metals in Europe, had caused a rise in the price of the necessities of life; and the wages of the workmen were far from rising in the same proportion. The guild system, which in the thirteenth century had been the protection of the weak, was tending more and more to become oppressively oligarchical; the management of manufactures became the monopoly of a rich, and in fact, hereditary caste. It was nearly impossible for a simple workman who was not a master's son nor supplied with capital to rise to the mastership. Conflicts between labor and capital were therefore frequent: combinations of the "companions" to obtain higher wages or better food; combinations of the "masters," who wished to control the labor market; and this in spite of the royal edicts that positively suppressed the

¹ I must except some of them, especially Mons. N. Weiss.

² I. 473. See Levasseur, *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières*, II. *passim*.

right of combination. The struggle between the employers' unions and those of the workingmen often ended in strikes; for instance, that great strike which, raging from 1539 to 1542, ruined the printing trade in Lyons and Paris and was not really appeased until 1571.¹

The workers' world was therefore a dissatisfied and turbulent one, eager for novelties, extremely apt to listen to revolutionary preaching. The development of French industries had drawn to France many foreign workmen, Flemish, Italian and especially German, who brought along with them foreign ideas. Moreover, the social agitation, especially in the great and mystical city of Lyons, was oftentimes mixed with religious agitation. For instance, at Lyons in 1529 the people rebelled on account of the extraordinary rise in the price of corn. They besieged and plundered the houses of the *consuls* (town councillors), whom they declared responsible for the famine; but they took care to destroy the statues of the saints with which one of these houses was adorned, while they spared the statues of the great men of antiquity, and the whole rising bears a strange religious character, as it were a revival of the old "Poor Men of Lyons."²

But long before this date the Reformed creeds had struck root among the working classes. At Meaux in 1525 Gerard Roussel had for his auditors the woolcombers, the carders, the fullers and drapers, drapery being the great industry of the town. One of these fullers was to be next year, at Metz in Lorraine, the first martyr of the French Reformation. The prelates, as Briçonnet, the scholars, the gentlemen, dared not offer their lives as a sacrifice for the new doctrine; but the humble worker, "ignorant in letters," would proclaim his faith at the stake. In 1528 a boatman of the Seine was executed at Paris, in 1531 some linen-weavers at Valenciennes. Above all, in the great persecution of 1534-1535, after the posting of the placards against the mass in the very room of the King, many names of workmen can be quoted.³ First, it is a shoemaker's son, the young paralytic Barthélemy Mollon; in his father's shop the poor cripple, while plying the awl, would read secretly the forbidden books; he explained them to his fellow-workmen, wherefore they had surnamed him "the Evangelist." Next it is a weaver, a hosier, a young dyer, a tailor, a shoemaker, a joiner, two ribbon-weavers. In the Limousin, some artisans coming from Flanders and Germany seem to have spread heresy among the industrious

¹ Hauser in the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, 1894, 1895, 1898.

² Hauser, *Revue Historique*, 1896.

³ *Bourgeois de Paris*, pp. 441-451; *Chronique de François Ier*, pp. 111-136; *Bull. du Protest.*, XI. 252.

population of Aubusson and Felletin.¹ At Le Puy-en-Velay, an eminently Catholic township, renowned throughout all Europe for its pilgrimage of the Virgin, a Catholic chronicler writes in 1539 that three-fourths of the people are tainted.² No doubt his estimate is too high, but he would not have thought of putting it thus if there had not been among the lower classes, as a matter of fact, a large Protestant group. At Bordeaux two artisans were burnt alive in 1541.³

Notwithstanding the persecutions of 1525-1526, the seed had persistently sprung up among the working classes at Meaux. It appeared clearly in 1545-1546 during the investigation preliminary to the trial which resulted in the execution of the Fourteen and of which Mr. Bower has given us so engaging a narrative.⁴ Upon the list of the fifty-seven suspects one reads none but plebeian names, and the world of carders and weavers again furnishes to the Inquisition its victims. A proof that the ranks of the dissenters were recruited chiefly from among them is that after 1546 the cloth trade of Meaux, hitherto prosperous, was ruined. M. N. Weiss has published under the title *La Chambre Ardente*⁵ the trials for heresy conducted by the Parliament of Paris in 1547, 1548 and 1549. Here again, the names are nearly always plebeian. The occupation of the accused is generally stated; they are, for the most part, weavers, fullers, shoemakers and cobblers, glaziers, bookbinders, hosiers, servants and chambermaids, locksmiths, coopers, tailors, pastry-cooks, joiners, peddlers, pewterers, masons, hatters, etc. All crafts are represented.

Bernard Palissy, "the potter of Saintonge," belonged to this class, and he has left us an account of what would take place. A poor artisan of Saintes preaches "the Gospel" to ten of his fellows. Six of them agree to preach on Sundays, each taking his turn once in six weeks; and being very ignorant they write their sermons beforehand, with the help of an ex-priest who has turned printer, and they read them. "Such was the beginning of the Reformed Church in the town of Saintes."⁶ It is a church of poor people; when they get a minister they cannot maintain him, "as there were few rich men in our congregation, and we could not afford to pay him his wages." But if money was scarce, their hearts were in the cause,

¹ A. Leroux, *Hist. de la Réforme dans la Marche et le Limousin*, p. 5.

² Estienne Médicis, *Chronique du Puy*, p. 502. He is here speaking of the French people in general. But he mentions heretics at Le Puy, pp. 387, 509-513.

³ Gaullieur, *Hist. du Parlement de Bordeaux*, I. 57.

⁴ *The Fourteen of Meaux*, London and New York, 1894.

⁵ Paris, 1889.

⁶ *Bull. du Protest.*, I. 83-93.

and on Sundays the journeymen would stroll about the country in troops singing psalms.

In truth, the transformation of these primitive congregations into regularly constituted churches, on the model (especially after 1550) of that of Geneva, did not immediately alter their frankly democratic character. When an inquiry was set on foot, in 1562, against the church of Beauvais, it was ascertained that for three years that church had had for its members drapers and woolcombers.¹ At Rouen, in 1560, the labor-party has become identified with the Reformed party; the cloth merchants, *i. e.*, the capitalists, actually proclaimed a lock-out against the workmen that attended the preachings. A truly revolutionary agitation fermented in that great industrial city, and presently found a vent for itself, as at La Rochelle, in the breaking of holy images.² At Nîmes a locksmith, a gardener, weavers, a carder, a coppersmith, a huckster, chambermaids are persecuted; at Issoire in Auvergne a cobbler, tailors, masons, bakers;³ at Le Puy, 1561, hosiers, cutlers, dyers, millers. Even at a later date this often is the case; in 1561, at Cambray, cambric-weavers, hosiers, shoemakers, etc., are examined.⁴

When religious persecutions threaten, the working classes emigrate. Nothing binds them to the land. A few tools and his two arms constitute all the capital of the workman; he carries them into countries where he can worship God in his own way and in his own speech. The ruin of French industries in the second half of the century is, for the most part, to be thus explained.⁵ We have already seen that no cloth-trade is left at Meaux after the trial of the Fourteen. The production of the Paris dye-works falls off by four-fifths; Amiens weaves no more; Lyons has but eighteen hundred silk looms instead of seven thousand, and printing is decaying there. It is an earlier manifestation of the phenomenon which was to follow the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the transferring of French industries to foreign lands. Montchrestien, an exile in England, works in a cutlery-house, where he meets French refugees. "England," says he, "has been so well taught by the skill of our men who have fled there for safety as to a harbor of refuge, that now she practises with glory and profit those same arts that we had long kept as our own."⁶ . . . In the cloth manufactory of Hamp-

¹ *Bull. du Protest.*, XXIII. 73.

² *Hist. Ecclès. des Églises Réf.*, I. 310.

³ Puech, *Renaissance et Réforme à Nîmes*, p. 152; Bouillet, *Anna'es d'Issoire*.

⁴ *Bull. du Protest.*, III. 255.

⁵ Smiles, *Huguenots in England*; Levasseur, *Hist. des Classes Ouvrières*, II.

⁶ *Traité de l'Économie Politique* (ed. by Funck-Brentano, 1889), pp. 48, 68; Laffemas, *Reiglement Général*. . . 1597, p. 20.

ton (Middlesex) he was "much surprised to hear, in almost every workshop, nothing but the French tongue." And even if poverty, the inevitable outcome of civil war, had driven out of France workmen of all persuasions, yet none but Reformed people appear among the French refugees entered upon the books of Lausanne from 1547 to 1574.¹ Among them the craftsmen are very numerous, and they come from every part of France; for instance a gunsmith from St. Étienne-en-Forez, a baker from the Tardenois, a shoemaker from the Velay, a pewterer from Flanders, a joiner from Joinville in Champagne, a cutler from Annecy in Savoy, etc.

The Venetian Contarini was therefore quite right when he wrote in 1572, "That sect consists for the most part of craftsmen, as cobblers, tailors, and such ignorant people. . . ."²

III.

It is not to be denied that the new religious tenets spread far more slowly and found much less favor among the country-folk than among the townspeople. The reason for this is, first, a social one: while the revolution of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was ruinous for the artisan, it was profitable to the peasant.³ The rent paid to the landlord, immutably fixed in the twelfth or thirteenth century, represented under the new values of money a very light burden, while the fall in the price of silver considerably raised the nominal worth of the products of the soil, when the villein sold them. The price of land was falling rapidly at the very time when the French gentry, ceasing to be an aristocracy of gentlemen-farmers and becoming a court-nobility, were compelled to sell their estates to meet their expenses and, as was said, "to put their mills and meadows on their shoulders." When a lord wished to sell at any price a part of his estates, there was always, in the parish, a countryman who had been, as one may say, saving money for centuries, and who, realizing at last the dream of bygone generations, bought land. Thus did the French villein become a landowner. The reign of Louis XII. and the beginning of that of Francis I. was for the French countryman an epoch of real prosperity; his situation presented a striking contrast with that of the German countryman, who, at the same date, was in danger of relapsing into bondage. We may easily understand why there was not in France, as in Germany, a peasants' revolution both social and religious.

The countryman, as he appears to us in the literature of that

¹ *Bull. du Protest.*, XXI. 463-478.

² *Relazioni*, IV. 242.

³ D'Avenel, *Hist. Économique de la Propriété*, . . . I. 92 et passim.

time, for instance in the *Propos Rustiques* of Noël du Fail, is a being who acts by routine, with a mind not easily open to new ideas, less accessible, therefore, than that of the turbulent craftsmen to the great currents of the time. He sticks to his old superstitions, whose root lies in the ancient Gallic heathenism, and which the Church has known how to transmute and to appropriate to its own purposes; he reveres the local saint, the saint of the wood, the mountain or the spring; he trusts to the tutelary ceremonies that bring rain or sunshine, keep away drought or hail, protect the cattle against mysterious diseases. He ever conceives of religion as a contract between superior beings, who have a right to a fair share of masses and wax tapers, and man, who in return hopes for divine protection. In such a world, the preaching of a pure worship, a worship "in spirit and in truth," the doctrine of grace as the sole and necessary deliverer of the soul, could hardly prove successful. No wonder then if, in 1539, the peasants of the Limousin drove away the preachers with stones and forks, as if they had been werewolves, and if, in 1572, Aluigi Contarini could write, "The people that live in the country are almost all free from that plague."

But let us beware of exaggeration. Did not Florimond de Raemond point out, as amongst the first heretics, "even those who had never done aught but handle the plough?" As early as 1525, when the Archbishop of Paris complains to the Parliament that there are suspects in his diocese, he mentions "a ploughman, in a village near this town."¹ At the same date we find signalized as dissenters in Thiérache "day-laborers who had gone to France as harvestmen," *i. e.*, people of the lowest grade in the rural class, people who, living merely from day to day, had not profited by the fall in the price of land, because they could not buy any, and who formed, from that time, a kind of agricultural proletariat.

In the rural portions of Normandy, for unknown reasons, "Lutheranism" had spread so much that to one district of that province was given the name of "little Germany." That district probably consisted of the environs of Rouen, the Vexin and the land of Caux, for we find after 1530² heretics at Anneville, at Sotteville, at Aumale and in every town and village of the neighborhood. At about the same time, a "protégé" of Marguerite d'Angoulême, the vicar Étienne Lecourt, evangelized the peasantry of Condé-sur-Sarthe. In Saintonge, about 1534, in an absolutely rural district, in the isles of Arvert, Oléron, Ré, many congregations sprang up, composed of fishermen and vinedressers. Here, as in a few other

¹ *Bull. du Protest.*, III. 28. The heretics, says he, are "gens de peu de savoir."

² *Bulletin*, 1887, p. 305.

districts, the countrymen showed their hostility against the Church by refusing to pay tithes; thus a material interest binds them to the Reformation.

In the lists given by M. Weiss for 1545-1549 we find proof of the existence of a rural Protestantism.¹ Indeed if heresy had been merely an urban growth we should find mentioned in those rolls none but centres of some importance. But we encounter names of places which were then, and in some cases have remained until now, nothing but small villages or hamlets, in Orléanais, Nivernais, Blésois, Puisaye, etc. (taking into account only the territory of the Parliament of Paris). When six heretics were discovered at Héronville near Pontoise, others at Lécourt near Langres, others at Sallers, St. Martin de Valmeroux, "and other places in the mountains of Auvergne," when twenty-two men and five women are arrested in a locality so unimportant as St. Maixent in Poitou, it is hard to believe that there were no field-laborers among the victims whose occupation is not mentioned in the decrees of the court.

At the time when actual churches were organized we find many of them in villages, especially in the South. At St. Jean de Gardonnenque, in the diocese of Nîmes, the parish church is abandoned, divine service is discontinued, and the population crowds about the minister. In Agenais, where feudalism has remained more oppressive than elsewhere, the religious rising takes a form not unlike that of the "jacquerie," as in Germany.² In the neighborhood of Vitry in Champagne fifteen villages called for ministers from Geneva.

Besides a free and spontaneous spreading of rural heresy, another element, about 1560, becomes highly active, *i. e.*, the influence of the Protestant gentlemen-farmers. The landlord of La Ferté-Fresnel in Normandy writes to the church of Geneva, October 28, 1561:³ "God has set me in authority over many men, and through these means one of the most superstitious districts of the realm will be gained to Christ." On his estates conversions have taken place by the hundreds, conversions by seigniorial decree. Therefore, although "this province has been the last to move," their church "is already well begun, and even bids fair to extend to fifteen or twenty leagues around." This "manorial" Protestantism spreads through "eight parishes around his castle." The success of the Reformation in the principalities of Bouillon and Montbéliard, in Béarn, and in the valleys of the Pyrenees was not unconnected with this very human element.

¹ *La Chambre Ardente.*

² Le Bourilly in *Bull. du Protest.*, 1895, p. 597.

³ *Bull.*, 1897, p. 461.

In any case, rural Protestantism was more important than has been commonly thought. In the midst of religious wars we find rural churches in the South, chiefly in Languedoc and the Cévennes, in Champagne, in Saintonge, etc. Till the eve of the Revolution these congregations survived. While the town craftsman had emigrated early, the countryman remained obstinately fixed to the soil. For instance, in Auvergne (where, nevertheless, the Reformation was never predominant) Protestantism, in 1685, is essentially a religion of field-laborers.¹

Throughout France it was, until about 1560, a religion of poor folk. It was only at that date that, in the words of a young scholar,² "the political conduct of the Guises gave leaders to the Reformed." In order to counteract the influence of the Lorraine princes, a portion of the French nobility—the Condés, the Chastillons and their followers—rushed into political and religious opposition; the Huguenots of Faith became Huguenots of State. From that time the great Protestant stream was appropriated by the nobility. The democratic Protestantism of the towns emigrated to Holland, England and Germany, and the trades-unions fell under the sway of the religious brotherhoods, which excluded the non-Catholics and were soon to lead the revolutionary movement of the League.

If Protestantism did not completely succeed in taking root in France, the reason may be, that in the sixteenth century, owing to the social state of the time, it won more adherents among the workmen, a travelling and migratory class, than among the peasantry, which was the stable and permanent element of the nation.

H. HAUSER.

¹ See Archives Nationales, T. T., 251, 232, 261.

² M. Le Bourrilly.

THE CAUSES OF CROMWELL'S WEST INDIAN EXPEDITION

SIR J. R. SEELEY, in his *Growth of British Policy*, regards the expedition against the West Indies as a mere incident unimportant in itself and in its relations and results. In his opinion Cromwell had no far-sighted plans in connection with the expedition, nor were economic considerations of more than mere secondary influence.¹ While the West Indian expedition at first glance seems of wholly minor significance, yet it is so vitally connected with the fundamental questions of Cromwell's government as to make it worth while to trace as far as possible the influences that prompted the attack on Spain, the origin of these influences, the extent of Cromwell's plans and whatever other considerations led to this expedition. In the first place, the affair was inseparably connected with his foreign policy. In the second place, it was inseparably connected with the religious movement on which Cromwell had ridden to power. In the third place, it had a vital connection with the most important economic questions of the Protectorate. Subsidiary to these were the questions: how to unite the Protestants of Europe and protect the Huguenots of France; how to prevent forever the return of the Stuarts to the English throne; and, still further in the background, how to recover England's ancient possessions in France.

At the very beginning of Cromwell's government the most important question in his foreign policy arose: Should he ally himself with France or with Spain? Cromwell never seriously intended making an alliance with Philip IV. unless driven to it as a last extremity. In spite of his turning now and then to Spain when unusually angered at France, his religious zeal and his economic hopes for England's greatness forced him back to the same point again—an attack on Spain. It is the dominant thought in his whole foreign policy.² He was bent on an accommodation with France, but he must first manœuvre Charles II. out of France, and establish his

¹ Vol. II., pp. 73-75.

² Although he did once offer to come to terms with Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador, it was in a moment of anger against France and was done in such a way as to make a consummation of the bargain extremely difficult. See Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, II. 446.

own position and power. He must also manœuvre France into giving a sufficient guarantee of the safety of the French Huguenots, whose welfare Cromwell had sincerely at heart. Spain was very useful in these diplomatic encounters.¹ Nor need the exorbitant and unwarrantable demands made on France cause us to think that Cromwell courted a rupture with Louis XIV. Cromwell desired an alliance with France, but Mazarin desired it more. While the negotiations were in progress Major Robert Sedgwick, under commission from Cromwell, made an unprovoked attack on Acadia and captured it. When Cromwell sent his expedition to the West Indies he instructed his commanders to capture French ships as well as Spanish. But neither of these acts produced a ripple on the stream of diplomacy.²

The problem of alliance, however, had no independent importance, for the solution of it depended entirely upon other influences than the mere wish to have England in the ordinary cordial relations with the rest of Europe. It was the religious and economic questions that were driving Cromwell on and that form the key to all that intricate maze which constitutes his foreign policy. With this key for a guide, and with the remembrance that the Protector hated Charles II. and all of the Stuart family and had to establish thoroughly his own power, his vacillation in his foreign policy becomes more apparent than real. The religious motives which influenced Cromwell to undertake this expedition—the desire for the union of the Protestant states of the world and for the establishment of Protestantism and religious freedom—are well understood. The problem of Cromwell's real character and motives is, of course, a most involved one, but it can safely be said that when his ambition did not absolutely conflict with his notions on religion, he was strongly influenced by his religious inclinations. Both now urged him against Spain. There was something of the spirit of the Crusades in Cromwell's attempt to overthrow the Spanish in the West Indies. It was to his mind a blow at Anti-Christ, an extension of the true kingdom of Christ in the world. In his judgment Protestantism was still in a critical condition, especially as Puritanism was on its decline, and needed a champion who could wield the sword if necessary.³ In addition, Cromwell's antagonism had, as was the

¹ See also Gardiner, II. 477-478.

² Thurloe, II. 583. John Leverett to Cromwell, September 5, 1654, tells of the capture of Acadia by Sedgwick in July of the same year. Mazarin was advised of it October 23, 1654, but must certainly have known it long before. However, there is no sign of protest on his part. See also Thurloe, II. 418, 419, 668.

³ Sir J. R. Seeley conjectures that the example of Gustavus Adolphus appealed strongly to Cromwell. It is questionable whether it was not rather that of Raleigh and the Elizabethans. See *Growth of British Policy*, II. 75.

case with many others, from the time of the anti-Spanish feeling during the reign of James, taken on a peculiar personal color, and this fact sharpened the edge of his desire to see Spain humbled.¹ The promptings, both early and late, which Cromwell had to the expedition, the whole general trend of English religious history from the time of Henry VII., the books that he must have read, the historical precedents which he would consider most sacred and binding, the precedents which he himself had established in the case of Ireland, his own deep religious life, all these influences directed him against Spain as the bulwark of the power of Rome.²

It is worth while noting that the religious ends for which the expedition was organized were fully impressed upon Cromwell's officers. After Sedgwick had been sent to Jamaica, one of the reasons he gave for not dispatching expeditions to harass the Spaniards was that the English did not have men enough to occupy the places captured "and so could not hope to effect our interests in the dispersing anything of the knowledge of the true God in Christ Jesus to the inhabitants."³ In his instructions to Daniel Gookin, who was sent to persuade New Englanders to emigrate to Jamaica, Cromwell said: "Our desire is that this place (Jamaica), if the Lord so please, be inhabited by people who know the Lord and walk in his fear, and by their light they may enlighten the parts about them (a chief end of our undertaking and design)."⁴ When Cromwell, angered at the refusal of the New England people to emigrate, vented his wrath on their agent, John Leverett, he said that in his mind one great reason why they ought to emigrate was that "that design hath its tendency to the overthrow of the man of sin."⁵

But the most powerful motives in bringing about the West Indian expedition were the economic. Cromwell's attitude toward economic questions is worthy of an examination which the limits of this article forbid. He certainly desired with his whole heart the unquestioned supremacy of England over the other nations of Europe. This he sought with unwavering persistency. England's position made it inevitable that her greatness should be commercial.

¹ The inconsistency between his frenzy against Spain and a leaning toward a Papist state like France troubled Cromwell's conscience. He referred to it in his fifth speech to Parliament and explained it lamely enough. Cromwell's *Letters and Speeches*, Carlyle, Chapman and Hall ed., 1893, Part IX., p. 164.

² Cromwell's mind had definitely centred on Spain as the moving power antagonistic to the Reformed religion and the English state. Even the Papists in England, Scotland and Ireland he considered "Spaniolised." See Fifth Speech, Carlyle.

³ Sedgwick to Thurloe, Thurloe, IV. 604.

⁴ Instructions to Gookin, in Granville Penn's *Life of Sir Wm. Penn*, II., App. H., 585-586.

⁵ Hutchinson, *Hist. Mass. Bay*, I. 190-192.

Her attitude toward the mercantile system, in relation to the great world-trade, was of vast importance. While no theorizer, Cromwell was immersed in the mercantile system of the time. The very fundamental idea of this system, begun by Richard II. and developed by Elizabeth, was that of national power. Therefore it appealed to Cromwell, who was erecting a great military state in England. The rise of nationalities and the discovery of America had hurried on the development of the mercantile system, and Cromwell came into power at its flood-tide. Since the discovery of America the world-commerce had enormously increased. The control of it brought with it national power, and all commerce and industry must be regulated with reference to England's position as compared with that of other nations. Under the mercantile system "treasure" was the best form of wealth, and the system consisted in (a) the accumulation of treasure, (b) the development of shipping and (c) the maintenance of an effective population.¹ In order to further these ends it was necessary to break through Spain's monopoly in the West Indies and gain control of Spanish America. The ablest economic writers of the time (one of whom,² at least, seems to have been in close relations with Cromwell), while they differed upon minor points agreed upon all the main points of the mercantile theory. Therefore, as far as Cromwell theorized at all, he drew his economic inspirations from undoubted believers in the full mercantile system. But Cromwell was a practical man, not a theorizer, and there is absolutely no sign that he could or would have worked out any original economic conceptions contrary to accepted doctrines. On the other hand, from the time when he was appointed a member of the Commission of Trade and Plantations in November 1643 until his attack on Spain, he manifested no deviation from the orthodox economic beliefs.

But although Cromwell had determined to satisfy his religious and economic desires by war if necessary, he made a first attempt to secure his wish by diplomatic action. He demanded of Spain two things. She must forego her monopoly in favor of England, give Englishmen freedom of trade in the West Indies and South America, and exempt English merchants and seamen from the operation of the Inquisition. But this in that day was like asking a nation to give up its independence. The whole life of Spain was bound up in her economic system and the absolute religious control exercised by the Inquisition. When these two demands were refused, the attack on Spain was assured.

¹ Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, I. 426.

² Sir Ralph Maddison.

There was no justification for a secret attack such as Cromwell made on the West Indies. Cromwell forced Spain to war by demanding what, according to the accepted theories of the time, he knew she could not grant. She had been far from committing such depredations on English commerce as France had committed. She had been the first to recognize the new Republic. She had been willing, even anxious, to ally herself with England either for active warfare against France, or without any stipulation as to France.¹ One cannot help feeling that Cromwell was guilty of a near approach to hypocrisy in his dealings with Spain about this expedition. His offers to Spain of an alliance had never been retracted nominally, although he had made such alliance impossible by his demands in regard to the Inquisition and freedom of trade in the West Indies. Cromwell was about to act unworthily of himself and in a manner very unlike his usual open way of doing things. Every one, except those immediately engaged, was ignorant of the purpose of his preparations. Everything was carried on in the dark, and various rumors misleading to Spain were set afloat. Without declaration of war or notice of any kind a fleet was fitted out, was sent out with the utmost secrecy as to its destination,² fell unawares upon the colonies of a friendly nation, and finally captured one of them before the defenceless people recovered from their surprise. Although Cromwell's conscience did not trouble him in the least about making the attack, after it was made he seemed anxious to clear his government from the charges of treachery and violation of international duties. This task was committed first to Milton, Cromwell's Latin Secretary, who partly repeats the allegations set out by Cromwell in his commission to Penn, Venables and others of August 18.³ But the outrages complained of had never before figured at all prominently, and evidently were made to do duty for the want of something better.⁴ Cromwell felt strongly, as time went on,

¹ When Cromwell became Protector, Cardenas on the part of the King of Spain congratulated him and expressed the true friendship of Spain as matters stood. But if Cromwell would take the crown, Cardenas promised that the King of Spain would venture his crown to defend him. Cardenas afterward proposed a strict alliance which should specially secure Cromwell's government and provide against the claims and title of Charles II.

² Even Penn and Venables were ignorant of the final destination of the enterprise until they got to Barbadoes.

³ *Manifesto of the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, etc., put forth by the consent and advice of his Council, in which the Justice of the Cause of this Commonwealth against the Spaniards is demonstrated*, November, 1655. Masson, *Life of Milton*, V. 240-242; John Milton's *Prose Works*, Bohn; and Stowe MSS. fol. 83, cited in Gardiner, II. 475.

⁴ Doubtless Cromwell and Milton, as well as the Presbyterians during the early part of the Protectorate, were disposed to assert that the death of Charles I. abrogated the treaty between Spain and England. See Cardenas to the King of Spain; Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, App. 9, 404.

the ill repute that attached to this act of war. He therefore was impelled to make a personal defence of it in his speech before Parliament, September 17, 1656.¹ He virtually found nothing to add to what had been said in his commission and Milton's *Manifesto*. The fact is that Cromwell's party in England was a minority party. The political forces against him were powerful. A brilliant stroke that should at the same time set England at the head of the mercantile system and overthrow the Papal power in the West Indies would redound to his glory in England and overshadow in the public mind the illegality of his position.²

Whatever the reasons or justification, Cromwell determined to get hold of the West Indies, and the origin of the influences and the sources of information that impelled him to his attack on Spanish America are not far to seek. In the first place Cromwell was Elizabethan.³ He belongs with Raleigh, Gilbert and Hakluyt. The whole aspect of the West Indian expedition is Elizabethan; either Cromwell is a unique survival of the Elizabethan spirit or else he drew his inspiration direct from Hakluyt, Raleigh and Peckham. Their hopes for the expansion of the British Empire were his; their ideas as to how to accumulate treasure from America, extend English trade and relieve the overburdened population of England were his; their religious reasons for attacking Spain in America were his; their allegations of the weakness of Spain and the cruelty of Spaniards toward the Indians were his. Indeed it seems probable that Cromwell and his advisers had been diligent readers of Hakluyt, Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* and Peckham's *Discoveries of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*.⁴ Gage's and Modyford's memorials to Cromwell, portions of Milton's *Manifesto* of 1655, and Cromwell's Fifth Speech are in large part restatements of Hakluyt's *Discourse on Planting*, or of Raleigh or Peckham.

It is entirely possible that the connecting link between the Elizabethans and Cromwell was *The English-American, or A New Survey of the West Indies*, by Thomas Gage, published in 1648. Gage

¹ He says: "With this King and State (Spain) I say, you are at present in hostility. We put you into this hostility . . . For we are ready to excuse this and most of our actions, and to justify them too, as well as excuse them," etc.

² Seeley in his *British Policy* confirms this, II. 99.

³ This is true only in a general sense. He partook of the spirit of the Elizabethan age as shown by others than Elizabeth. For personally Elizabeth and Cromwell are opposites. The first represents England at rest; the second England in motion.

⁴ See especially Hakluyt's *Discourse on Western Planting*, *Maine Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 2nd Ser., Vol. II.; Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* in his *History of the World*, Vol. VI., edition of 1820, together with *Considerations on the Voyage to Guiana* in the same volume; and *A True Report of the late Discoveries*, etc., by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, by Sir Geo. Peckham, Hakluyt's *Voyages*, III. 308.

had an eventful history, and was no doubt the best-informed man in England on Spanish America.¹ His book created a sensation and was widely read.² The Dedicatory Epistle is addressed to Fairfax, whom he tries to spur on to undertake the conquest of America. Gage was undoubtedly familiar with most writers on the New World, although he says in his dedication that no one had written upon America for a hundred years. This statement proves Gage to be not over-scrupulous, for he mentions no authority, except Las Casas, to whom the hundred years would apply. He copied parts of his *English-American* word for word from Thomas Nicholas's *Conquest of the West Indies*, which was in turn, as he must have known, a translation of Gomara. Not only so, but it is altogether probable that he was acquainted with the accounts of Mexico and the West Indies published in Purchas.³ Parts of Gage's Dedicatory Epistle are very likely Hakluyt and Raleigh; and if he would take bodily from Nicholas's translation he would do the same by Raleigh and Hakluyt.

¹ Gage came from Surrey, was educated as a Jesuit priest in Spain, but joined the order of St. Dominic. He was selected as a missionary to Spanish America and was smuggled into the colonies. He lived in Spanish America twelve years, mostly in Mexico and Central America. He returned to Spain, then to England, and renounced his religion about 1641. His work, *The English-American*, was the first adequate description of this whole vast and unknown region. Gage joined the side of Parliament and thus commended himself to Cromwell. See *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

² Parts of the *English-American* were done into French and German, and later into Spanish.

³ Southey in his edition of *Madoc* with notes, London, 1805, p. 468, refers to this, but describes Nicholas's *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the West India*, etc., as translated from Bernal Diaz, instead of Gomara. Nicholas's translation was published in 1596. It was republished in Purchas, III., Book IV., chapter 9, ed. 1617. Gage copied his account of Cortez in many places word for word from Nicholas and not from Purchas. In his account of Mexico he may have followed Purchas's adaptation of Nicholas. He used the same ideas and often the same words and phrases, only changing the order of sentences and paragraphs. At any rate it is hardly conceivable that he should not have known of the account of Mexico in Purchas. If so he could not have failed to notice the account immediately preceding Nicholas's translation in Purchas, called *History of the Mexican Nation described in Pictures*, and the connection of Hakluyt, Raleigh and Spellman with it. Purchas was a writer well known in New England even, and these accounts of America are there commented on. See Rev. John Higginson to Rev. Thomas Thatcher, *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III. 318. The fourth volume of Purchas contains among others a translation of Las Casas copied from the translation of 1583. See further *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the West India, now called New Spaine*, etc., translated out of the Spanish tongue by T. N., 1578, London, 1596. The attention of the world seems to have been drawn about this time to Spanish America and Spain's treatment of the Indians. Las Casas had been translated into Dutch, Flemish, Latin, German and English (Winsor, II. 341). In 1655 was published *America; or an exact Description of the West Indies*, etc., by N. N., Gent., London; also a second edition of Gage's *English-American*. In 1656 appeared *The Tears of the Indians*, etc., by John Phillips (a nephew of Milton), a translation of Las Casas. The article on Phillips and his relations to Milton and Cromwell in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* is misleading. In 1699 Gage's book was translated into Spanish.

Thomas Challoner wrote the metrical dedication of Gage's book, which shows acquaintance with the writings of Purchas, Hakluyt, Ramusio and Raleigh.¹ It is very improbable that Gage, who was so much associated with Challoner, should not also have been acquainted with these authors as well as with Las Casas and Gomara.² The whole book is an attempt to arouse Englishmen against Spain and "Rome's Idolatry" and to show how valuable these provinces would be to England because of trade and of mines and bullion.

But Fairfax soon ceased to be the most pronounced leader of the revolution in England and Cromwell took his place. Gage then transferred his urgings to Cromwell, and six years later sent as a memorial to the Protector simply a résumé of his *English-American*.³ In it he skilfully brings forward what would most appeal to Cromwell through his economic and religious notions. He draws a tempting picture of the prospective trade of ginger, hides, sugar, wheat, wines, and bullion from the mines of Mexico and Peru. He is careful to mention the fact that "the power of Austria (Rome's chief strength and pillar) is in the American mines." He shows that the sparse population of this vast territory would make it an easy matter to expel the Spaniards; that the Indians could offer no opposition because not allowed to carry arms; that the interior towns also had no walls or guns. This memorial is put down in Thurloe's *State Papers* as belonging to December, 1654. But it bears internal evidence of having been written before December. There are indications that it was sent at Cromwell's request or at the request of some one for him.⁴ There seems to be no reasonable doubt that Gage had great influence in determining Cromwell's mind as to the expedition.⁵ If so, it is impossible that the memo-

1 "Reader, behold presented to thine eye,
What us Columbus off' red long agoe,
Of this New-World a new discoverie,
Which here our author doth so clearly show;
That he the state which of these parts would know
Need not hereafter search the plenteous store
Of Hakluyt, Purchas and Ramusio," etc.

Again:

"Renowned Rawleigh, . . .
And thereof writ both what he saw and knew."

² Gage was acquainted with the history of early discovery and speaks in his Dedictory Epistle of Columbus at the Court of Henry VII. In his memorial to Cromwell he likens himself to Columbus.

³ Thurloe, III. 59.

⁴ Gage had some communication with the government previous to the date of this memorial. On August 20, 1653, he sent a certificate in behalf of the widow of a pilot, one of his flock. Very likely he was asked to do so because of his standing with Cromwell. *State Papers Domestic*, 1653-4, p. 482.

⁵ Ludlow in his *Memoirs*, I. 417, says that Gage "was reported to have been a princi-

rial should have been sent as late as December, when all of Cromwell's plans were matured, and it certainly contemplates preparations to be made, not preparations already completed. There is no sign in it that Gage had been appointed chaplain to Venables or knew that he was to have a place in the expedition,¹ and Gage says, "Nothing can be acted upon the mainland until October."²

In this connection it is necessary to consider a like memorial by Thomas Modyford, governor of Barbadoes. He was consulted because of his experience in that part of the world and because he had performed valuable service for the Commonwealth party in the struggle between Ayscue and Lord Willoughby over Barbadoes.³ He advised the selection of Guiana, on the South American coast, and corroborated Gage in many particulars, especially as to the comparative ease with which Spanish America could be conquered. If any island was taken he advised Cuba.⁴ This document, too, is put down in Thurloe as belonging to December 1654. It certainly was written in answer to a request for Modyford's opinion and advice, which surely would not have been asked after all preparations were made.⁵ Both these memorials ought to be referred to the time before August 18th, when Cromwell issued his commission to Penn, Venables and others. They belong, with Cooper's letter to Thurloe, Mazarin's letter to Cromwell and the influence of John Cotton and Roger Williams in the matter, to the same general period previous to August 1654, and represent the season when

pal adviser of this undertaking." That this was true was the popular impression in Bishop Burnet's time. (See *Hist.*, I. 49.) He says in substance that while Cromwell was balancing in his mind this project, "Gage . . . came over from the West Indies" and influenced the Protector by his accounts of the wealth of the Spaniards and the feebleness of Spanish America. This illustrates Burnet's inaccuracy, for Gage returned to England seventeen years before Cromwell undertook this expedition. See also Long, *Hist. of Jamaica*, I. 221.

¹ On December 20 the Council registered an order for a ship to convey Gage to the fleet at Portsmouth. While the date is December 20, it is noted in the entry that he had already gone, and also that the warrant was issued on a previous order of the Protector. It is therefore altogether probable that he was appointed chaplain a considerable time before. Gage's words about himself as "one who waits for the conversion of the poor Indians," lead one to think that his motive in sending the memorial was that he might receive some such appointment.

² He also hopes that Cromwell's faith may *yet* be active abroad as well as at home, and that he may become the protector of the Indians as of England.

³ *Cavaliers and Roundheads, 1650-2*, by N. Darnell Davis, p. 209.

⁴ Long in his *History of Jamaica* accuses Modyford of advising Guiana instead of the islands for selfish reasons, on the ground that adding to the English sugar-producing islands would increase the supply and lower the profits. Modyford's reasons, however, given in his memorial, are perfectly sound and convincing.

⁵ It advises Cromwell to *land* in Barbadoes in November, if he can. Modyford would hardly have written such advice if there had been a possibility that it would not reach Cromwell until December.

Cromwell was balancing in his mind the question of an attack upon Spain.

The origin of the more theoretical economic influences ought not to be overlooked. Among the ablest economic writers of that age are Mun, Malynes and Maddison, all of whom lived in Cromwell's time and all of whom preached at bottom the same doctrines as to the mercantile system.¹ Sir Ralph Maddison seems to have been the economic authority of the Protector and his *Great Britain's Remembrancer*, based upon Malynes's *Lex Mercatoria*, was addressed or dedicated to Cromwell.²

Evidently Cromwell, before he had ratified the peace with the Dutch,³ but when he felt assured that the war was at an end, had been looking into the matter of the West Indies. He, or some one for him, applied to one William Cooper for suitable persons to act as guides in the waters adjoining Spanish America. He was anxious for information as to ports, and the latitude and longitude of islands in the Gulf of Mexico. Cooper in reply to the application furnished Thurloe a book in Dutch setting out the desired information, which was not to be had in English. In answer to Cromwell's request for information, he says: "How far this may contribute, I submit to you (Thurloe) and others." That the plans of Cromwell were somewhat mature and were known to Cooper appears from the fact that Cooper advises him, in the choice of captains and others, to be sure to choose as many as possible who have become accustomed to the heat of that climate. He even goes so far as to recommend two persons for responsible positions. Evidently he had talked with Thurloe or Cromwell before about this, or some other matter connected with it, for he mentions having given former notice about Powell, whom he now recommends. He also intimates that he will have further information.⁴

Cardinal Mazarin's powerful hand is also seen in this expedition. With that crafty insinuation which he knew how to use with deadly effect, we find him in nearly every letter through Bordeaux and De Baas holding up the bait of the West Indies before Cromwell. In a letter to his ministers, March 25, 1654, he made the first ad-

¹ Mun was an advocate of the mercantilist theory as to bullion, while Malynes was a bullionist. They both, however, had the same end in view. See Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, etc., and Palgrave, *Dict. of Polit. Econ.*; also Malynes's *Lex Mercatoria*.

² Edward Misselden ought also to be mentioned. He seems to have had no influence with Cromwell, having been a supporter of Laud and the King. Nevertheless, he afterward offered his services to Cromwell (December 1654), apparently without success. Thurloe, III. 13.

³ Ratified by Cromwell, April 19, 1654; proclaimed April 26th of same year.

⁴ Thurloe, II. 250, April 26, 1654.

vances in a roundabout reference to a foreign war.¹ Two days later, he openly urged the Protector to a war in which he could not only get Dunkirk, but make as much progress as he wished in the Indies,² and on May 8th he added another inducement which weighed heavily with one committed to the mercantile system. He urged Cromwell, while he had a large fleet afloat,³ to employ it against the West Indies, which he said were in poor condition. He also furnished Cromwell with information, received from various sources in Spain, as to when the galleons would arrive at Cadiz, and urged their capture.⁴ Only twelve days later, in order to keep the Protector's mind occupied with the thought, he bade De Baas again approach Cromwell.⁵ Then he advanced a step further and offered to assist England in the capture of the two Indian fleets having on board six millions in gold. He would either join Cromwell in the business, or if the Protector wished to conceal his share in the matter, it could be done as he desired, and his share of the profits be faithfully guarded.⁶ Cromwell was perfectly willing to receive all of Mazarin's suggestions and valuable information, but he did not intend that France should have any claims upon the Indies, and all such offers were refused.

Mazarin's hint that England could have without molestation all of the Spanish Indies that she could conquer, was strengthened by Cromwell's knowledge of the weakness of the Spanish colonies. The mercantile and colonial systems which Spain considered her great prop were having a disastrous effect upon her colonies.⁷ While the laws enacted by the Council of India were in the main enlightened and remarkably careful of the rights and privileges of the natives, the actual government in Spanish America was exceedingly oppressive. Under the system of personal service, and the method of apportioning natives to compulsory labor, the population had rapidly declined and with it the strength of the colonies.⁸

It is interesting and important to notice the connection of New

¹ *Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, Mazarin, VI. 134. These letters constitute a strong proof that Cromwell early in 1654 had definite intentions against the West Indies. Mazarin with the subtle skill of which he was master had gained in some manner an inkling of the truth.

² *Id.*, p. 139.

³ Referring to the capture of French vessels by an English fleet off St. Malo.

⁴ *Documents Inédits*, etc., Mazarin, VI. 157.

⁵ *Id.*, VI. 163.

⁶ *Id.*, VI. 171.

⁷ See *Historia de la Economía Política en España*, por Don Manuel Colmeiro, II. Capitulo LXXVIII., Sistema Colonial.

⁸ See *Recopilación de Leyes de las Indias*, edited by Boix, for Acts of Council of India, whose remedial legislation is the strongest possible proof of the extreme cruelty in the actual administration of affairs in Spanish America.

England with the West Indian expedition and the influence which New Englanders had in helping Cromwell to make up his mind in regard to it. Cromwell kept up some correspondence with William Hooke, then pastor in New Haven, Conn., who was a confidant of the Protector and related to him by marriage. A message to John Cotton through Hooke brought on a correspondence between Cotton and Cromwell. Cotton took occasion to urge the religious necessity of driving the Spaniards from America. As we shall see this seems to have, perhaps first, set the matter definitely before Cromwell's mind.¹ Cotton wrote to Cromwell July 28, 1651, and Cromwell answered about a month after the battle of Worcester.² It was some time during this correspondence and before the last of 1652 that Cotton urged Cromwell to "dry up Euphrates."³ So much of the correspondence as is extant would indicate that Cotton exercised some influence over Cromwell. Therefore, when the latter became Protector, the idea of his religious duty as to Spain was by no means new to him.

But there was a nearer American influence to Cromwell than John Cotton, far away in New England. Roger Williams went to England in November of 1651 and remained until 1654. Williams was strongly drawn towards Oliver, whom he called a second Cromwell raised up to champion religious liberty, and evidently the feeling was fully reciprocated.⁴ While in England he was in peculiarly close relationship with the Protector, and in his letter to the General Court of Massachusetts Bay, October 5, 1654, speaks of his many "private discourses" with "divers of the chief of our nation, and especially his Highness."⁵ To Williams, Cromwell disclosed his most secret religious thoughts and fears, which throw a strong light on what was driving him against Spain.⁶ So far did Williams's knowledge extend that he could say positively, "I know the Protector had strong

¹ See *Diary of Samuel Sewall, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 436-437 and quotations made hereafter.

² October 2, 1651. See *Coll. of Original Papers of Mass. Bay Colony*, Hutchinson, p. 233, for Cotton's letter; and Cromwell's *Letters and Speeches*, Carlyle, Part VII., p. 308, for Cromwell's. Cromwell's letter is in the Lenox Library, New York City.

³ Cotton died December 23, 1652. There is nothing in Cotton's letter about this expedition nor in Cromwell's answer. The character of both letters would indicate that it was between the time of the battle of Worcester and December 1652, and while Roger Williams was in England, that Cotton urged upon Cromwell a blow at Spain. Williams and others refer to Cotton's part in the matter as too well known to require explanation.

⁴ *Narragansett Club Publications*, VI. 193.

⁵ *Id.*, p. 270.

⁶ "The late renowned Oliver confessed to me, in close discourse about the Protestants' affairs, etc., that he yet feared great persecutions to the Protestants from the Romanists, before the downfall of the Papacy." Roger Williams to John Winthrop, Jr., February 6, 1660, in *Narragansett Club Publications*, VI. 307.

thoughts of Hispaniola and Cuba."¹ His positive knowledge of Cromwell's intentions and finally of his plans was gained months before the commission of August 18th, and beyond any doubt was the result of discussion covering all the time since his arrival in England.²

John Winthrop, Jr., who had already heard something about the expedition,³ applied to Williams for information. Williams replied under date of December 15, 1654, in the letter in which he referred to the Protector's intentions as to Hispaniola and Cuba. He adds: "Mr. Cotton's interpreting of Euphrates to mean the West Indies,⁴ the supply of gold (to take of taxes) and the provision of a warmer Diverticulum and Receptaculum than New England is, will make a footing into those parts very precious."⁵

There is a very interesting letter by Rev. John Higginson, of Guilford, Conn., to Rev. Thomas Thacher of Weymouth, Mass., written October 25, 1654. He speaks of the destitution in New England and says that many were inclined to remove to Ireland, which Cromwell had tried before to colonize with New England people. He says further that Cromwell had signified his intention of doing what he could for the people of New England, whose condition he was sensible of; that if they would remove he might give them the opportunity where they should have towns, habitations and staple commodities. Higginson then conjectures the place to be Hispaniola or Mexico. He goes on: "A great fleet was prepared to be sent thitherward, and its thought that it was to drive out the Spaniard, which if it be effected there may be room enough for all New England people and many more, . . . Having constant intelligence from some nearly related to me, who are also nearly related to the Lord Protector,⁶ we of Guilford are as like to share in any privileges there as any other . . . Its thought by some that the design for the West Indies may be the means to dry up Euphrates, viz., the stream of supportments that makes glad the city of Rome, etc."⁷ The correspondence which Higginson refers to, in which

¹ *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 4th Ser., VI. 286, quoted hereafter.

² Williams wrote John Winthrop, Jr., July 12, 1654. It was his first letter after his return to America. If his passage took a month or six weeks his positive knowledge of Cromwell's intentions must have been gained at least before June 1, 1654. This letter to Winthrop contains nothing about the West Indian expedition, Williams evidently considering it a secret until the time set for its departure.

³ *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd Ser., X. 1.

⁴ How did Williams know of Cotton's interpretation except through Cromwell?

⁵ *Id.*, 4th Ser., VI. 286.

⁶ Samuel Desbrow, brother of John Desbrow, brother-in-law of Cromwell; see Bernard C. Steiner's *History of Guilford and Madison, Conn.*, pp. 41, 65, 67.

⁷ *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III, 318; *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 437. See also Prince, *History of New England*; and Steiner's *History of Guilford*, p. 74.

Cromwell had signified his intention of doing what he could for the people of New England, went back to March 5, 1654, and earlier. The place of relief which Cromwell had so early in mind, Higginson (and probably Governor Leete of Guilford) understood, no doubt with the best of reason, to be Hispaniola or Mexico. For the Protector had notified New England people, undoubtedly through Samuel Desbrow in the correspondence about March 1654, that the project of their removal to Ireland was at an end.¹

There is a passage in the diary of Samuel Sewall, dated November 10, 1696, which supplies a curious confirmation of many facts as to this West Indian expedition, although written nearly forty years after Cromwell's death. It helps also to make plain the influence which New England men had in determining the Protector's mind to an attack on Spain. Sewall mentions a ride to Salem. He went to visit Governor Bradstreet, "who," he says, "confirms what had formerly (been) told me about Mr. Gage his being in the expedition against Hispaniola and dying in it."² November 11: "In the even visited Major Brown, there sung First part of 72 Ps. and last part of 24th. But first, visited Mr. Higginson, though [he] had din'd with us. He tells me that the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, when Gen^l wrot to Mr. Hook of Newhaven, and therein sent commendations to Mr. Cotton; upon which Mr. Cotton was writt to by Mr. Hook and desir'd to write the Gen^l, which He did, and advis'd him that to take from the Spaniard in America would be to dry up Euphrates; which was one thing put Him upon this Expedition to Hispaniola, and Mr. Higginson³ and 3 more were to have gone to Hispaniola if the Place had been taken. O. Cromwell would have had Capt. Leverett to have gone thether Gov^r, told him was drying up Euphrates, and He intended not to desist till He came to the Gates of Rome. This Mr. Cooke said he had heard his father Leverett tell many a time. Gov^r Leverett said My Lord let us make an end of one voyage first and declin'd it; at which Oliver was blank."⁴

Williams, Cotton, Hooke and Higginson all had unusual opportunities of discussing with Cromwell such an undertaking, or else had unusual opportunities of knowing whether the idea had been fixed early in the Protector's mind. Thus before the seductive influences of Mazarin had turned Cromwell's eyes toward the West

¹ Steiner, *History of Guilford and Madison, Conn.*, p. 67; *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III. 318. "Many have inclined to Ireland, but that is now at an end; the L. Prot. hath sent word that it is wholly disposed of."

² He died in Jamaica in 1656.

³ This is the same John Higginson as the writer of the previous letter.

⁴ *Diary of Samuel Sewall, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 436-7.

Indies, John Cotton and Roger Williams, at least, had discussed with him this blow at the chief support of the Church of Rome.¹

It is important also to notice how far Cromwell's plans extended. He had no idea of the world-wide expansion of the British Empire in the modern sense, *i. e.*, of a union of colonies on an equal footing with the mother country. But, nevertheless, he did have a well-grounded idea, though somewhat undefined, of a widely extended British Empire, and his schemes of conquest were far-reaching. The events connected with this expedition when taken together bring out not only a policy, well considered and tenaciously held to, of setting England at the head of the navigation and mercantile system and at the head of all opposition to the Church of Rome, but also the profound calculation of Cromwell looking to the extension of the colonial system of England. St. Domingo was by no means the end of his designs. He saw in imagination England as the centre of a great naval empire. In this he anticipated the future and was the forerunner of modern English governmental policy. After St. Domingo was taken, according to Cromwell's profound scheme, England was gradually to absorb the rest of the Spanish possessions in America. This was the meaning of his talks with Roger Williams and Thomas Gage. This was in the direct line of the religious impulse that so strongly urged him against Spain. To this the economic influences that controlled Cromwell inevitably pointed. His designs took in the mainland of South America, and he already saw in imagination Guiana and the country between the Orinoco and Porto Bello in his possession. He had asked Cooper for information about all of the Gulf of Mexico from the Bahamas, and what course to steer from place to place, and Cooper recommended Captain Shelley because he knew most of the American coasts and had been south beyond the Rio de la Plata. He recommended Captain Powell because he had been in the Mexican Gulf "from top to bottom."²

A reference to the instructions given by Cromwell to the heads of the expedition discloses at once the very thorough manner in which the whole affair had been discussed and how fully developed were the plans. The commanders were directed first to gain an interest in that part of the West Indies which was in the possession of the Spaniard. Three methods of attack had been discussed by

¹ We are obliged to believe that Williams felt that there were good and sufficient grounds for an attack on Spain, and that considerations other than the religious warranted it, because of his strong stand against propagating the Gospel by the sword. See his letter to Endicott in which he says that no man can maintain his Christ by the sword and maintain a true Christ. *Narragansett Club Publications*, IV. 502.

² Thurloe, II. 250.

the Protector and were brought to the attention of Penn and Venables. The first was to land on some of the islands, particularly Hispaniola and St. John's Island, one or both.¹ Or, second, the expedition might make for the mainland anywhere between the Orinoco and Porto Bello, aiming principally at Carthagena.² Or, third, the two former methods could be combined so as to allow an attack on St. Domingo, or Porto Bello and afterward Carthagena.³ Modyford urged upon Cromwell the opportunities of taking Trinidad, and the country about the Orinoco, Venezuela and so on around to Carthagena. Gage discloses even more extensive plans of conquest and the influence of the plans of both Gage and Modyford is easily discernible in Cromwell's matured instructions. Gage brought before the Protector the picture of the conquest of Cuba, Honduras, Hispaniola, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Trinidad, Yucatan and, as a final step, Mexico and Peru. He expressed the hope of seeing him in full sway in Spanish America as he was in England. He clearly understood and described how weak Spain was. All Indians were, he said, deprived of arms, as were negroes and mulattoes, whether bond or free. In this he was correct.⁴ He was right, too, in saying that if the freedom of the slaves were proclaimed they could be depended upon to join the English.⁵ From the very beginning of the expedition General Penn had gone on the principle of extending British sovereignty over all possible portions of the Spanish domain. Almost the very day he captured Jamaica, in May 1655, he sent the *Martin* from Jamaica along the Spanish Main to Carthagena and the *Grantham* to Trinidad. Vice-Admiral Goodson, his successor, made attempts on Carthagena and Santiago de Cuba, was constantly on the lookout for further conquest and discussed the capture of Havana. Sedgwick, when virtually governor of Jamaica, also discussed with Cromwell the taking of Havana and Carthagena, and recommended getting the country

¹ This conformed to Gage's plan. It is to be noted that Mr. J. W. Fortescue in his article on this expedition printed in *Macmillan's Magazine*, LXIX. 184, says that Gage favored an attack on the mainland and Modyford on Cuba and Hispaniola. Gage is the one who very especially urged Hispaniola and Modyford the mainland about the Orinoco. See Thurloe, III. 59-63.

² This was in the main Modyford's plan.

³ Extract from instructions to Gen. Robert Venables, taken from Burchett, pp. 385-6. Cromwell says in these instructions that he communicates "what hath been under our consideration."

⁴ *Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias*, II. 320, Ordinances XV., XVI., XVII., XVIII.

⁵ The ordinances in the *Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias* in regard to mulattoes, negroes, etc., show that runaway slaves were numerous, that they were very ill-disposed toward the Spaniards and gave them much trouble. Modyford, also, advised arming the Indians about the Orinoco when they should be won over.

"down Ryo de Hatch and so to Santa Martha."¹ Among the Spanish prisoners brought by Penn's fleet to England was a native of the Canaries, with whom Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador, at once communicated. While a prisoner at Jamaica he had heard it said by English officers that among the plans they were to put into execution was the capture of St. Augustine, in Florida. Cardenas was sufficiently impressed with the correctness of the information to communicate it at once to his government.² In October 1655, Cromwell wrote to the following effect: "And it is much designed among us to strive with the Spaniard for the mastery of all those seas," etc.³ Nor should we lose sight of Sedgwick's capture of Acadia, although an attack on French territory, in the summer of 1654.

The advisers of Charles II. understood how far-reaching were Cromwell's plans in regard to conquest and colonization and perceived the real motives of his attack on the West Indies. "A.B." in writing to the King of Spain, January 1656, in behalf of Charles, lays great stress on the fact that Cromwell intended to colonize the West Indies and by his fleet cut off the Spanish trade.⁴ In fact on other grounds the entire expedition has no meaning. To suppose that after such enormous preparations and expense the Protector would be content with a few square miles of territory falls hardly short of absurd.

Notwithstanding the suggestions he received, this was in a peculiar sense Cromwell's own design. In originating and developing it he acted with practically unlimited authority. He took this momentous step alone. He had no parliamentary sanction for it, and many of the influential members of his Council were opposed to it. Nevertheless he persevered as a king might have done, for he was a king in fact. He ran counter to what, on the surface, seemed for England's advantage. He was opposed by the trading class, who looked only to the immediate effect on commerce of such a move. It meant a rupture with Spain, and great numbers of vessels and great quantities of English goods would be liable to seizure. It meant sudden ruin to merchants whose support of the government was necessary, and whose ships and goods would be confiscated.

¹ Sedgwick to Thurloe, January 24, 1655-6. Thurloe, IV. 454. This would include a considerable part of the western coast of South America.

² Cardenas to King of Spain, October 4, 1655. Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, II., App., p. 447.

³ Cited from *The Expedition to the West Indies, 1655*, by J. W. Fortescue, *Macmillan's Magazine*, LXIX. 184, March, 1894. Note in this connection the diary of Samuel Sewall, in which Cromwell is said to have told Leverett that he did not intend to desist until he came to the gates of Rome.

⁴ British Historical Manuscripts Commission, Portland MSS., I. 679.

It meant perhaps a fatal reaction against the Protector himself. It was a critical point in Cromwell's career. The trade and manufacturing interests are powerful interests for any one to oppose. But like the great man he was, he was looking not at immediate risks alone, but at ultimate effects as well. Cromwell could not turn back; to give way and abandon his West Indian plan would have given such a shock to his reputation as to endanger his position. Through it all he kept a well-balanced judgment and a confident, resolute manner. He redoubled his efforts. He appealed to the political and religious prejudices of the people. He silenced if he did not convince the merchants and manufacturers, who are ever prone to favor those policies which will yield immediate rather than ultimate commercial advantages. Cromwell stood on the threshold of a new age. He belonged both to the past and to the future. He represents a curious blending of religious zeal and modern commercial spirit, eager, unrelenting, never-tiring. Religious interests as the basis of political action were passing away and in their place were coming the commercial interests of a new age. The bonds of religious unity were not the forces that in the new era could bind states together. The growth of national feeling, of independence and political unity, had forever supplanted them. Therefore any hope of uniting the Protestant states was futile. Nor could he hope to propagate Protestantism by the sword. The West Indian expedition was in some sense epochal. It opened a new era for England. It began the policy of the true expansion of the British Empire. It determined the economic policy, not only of the Protectorate, but of the Restoration. It determined England's relation to, and laid the foundation for her supremacy in, the mercantile and colonial system until the last years of the eighteenth century.

FRANK STRONG.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH DEPENDENCIES IN THE FURTHER EAST

THE striking diversity of Great Britain's administration of her various dependencies in the Malay Peninsula and around the China Sea is due to the history of their establishment and growth. Thrown in comparatively close proximity, can be seen four distinct methods of governing Asiatic possessions. There exist almost side by side: (1) the Straits Settlements, exhibiting the system characteristic of the government of India, that of holding certain strategic points under direct British administration, while controlling, as a dependent protectorate, a number of states, whose native rulers are guided in their internal government by British officers; (2) the state of Sarawak, of which the labor and the profits of government belong to an individual, who possesses the attributes of sovereignty, but yet is a British subject and under the protection of the British government; (3) the territories of the British North Borneo Company, the first created of the new governing companies founded on the lines of the old East India Company, rendering profits to stockholders but under elaborate charter restrictions; and (4) the island of Hong Kong, which is from its geographical conditions unable to expand over adjoining territory, and is held for commercial and military reasons under the direct administration of the British Colonial Office.

In all these four dependencies local conditions have influenced administrative development, but in their history, even more than in their local conditions, can be traced the different causes which have led to the difference of their administrative expedients. Though the problems their administrators have to face are somewhat different there are yet certain characteristics common to them all. In each the problem of the Chinaman is present. The commercial gifts of that most commercial of races have placed the business interests of all four dependencies in Chinese hands, while the political difficulty of effectively managing the members of the race most alien to European ideas needs the most careful handling. In three of the four dependencies the Malays complicate the difficulty of handling the Chinese, for the *Pax Britannica* prevents the Malays from mur-

dering their astute commercial oppressors and the government is therefore forced to take measures for their protection.

It is not proposed in this article to deal with the actual condition of the four British dependencies in the Further East or to describe in detail the existing systems of administration. Such information can be easily obtained from the different Blue Books and official reports, of which summaries can be found in such easily accessible works of reference as the *Colonial Office List* and the *Statesman's Year-book*. A brief account of their history and geography can be read in the excellent *Historical Geography of the British Colonies* by C. P. Lucas.¹ It is intended rather to deal with the administrative evolution of the four dependencies, pointing out the salient points of their history and thus illustrating the complexity of the colonial administration of the British Empire.

When the hundred years of the Portuguese monopoly of the Asiatic trade with Europe came to an end with the appearance of the Dutch in 1596 and of the English in 1600 in Asiatic seas, the merchants of the two great Protestant trading nations made first for the Spice Islands. It was the peppers and the spices of the Further East that promised the largest profit; and the first factories, as the establishments were called where stocks of the desired commodities were collected for conveyance to Europe by the annual fleets, were founded by both the Dutch and the English in the islands of Java and Sumatra. The rivalry between the Dutch and the English merchants was extreme, and the massacre at Amboyna in February 1623 roused the wrath of the whole English nation. As the seventeenth century proceeded the rival nations gradually separated their areas of Asiatic trade. The Dutch East India Company devoted itself mainly to the importation of peppers and spices, and for this reason concentrated its energies upon the Spice Islands, Ceylon and the Malabar coast of India, while the London East India Company, without surrendering its desire to compete in this lucrative business, fixed its attention rather upon India, and fostered its trade with Surat and Bengal and, after its foundation in 1639, with Madras. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, when English power in Europe was increasing while that of the Dutch was waning, the affairs of the London East India Company were vigorously managed by a great statesman. Sir Josiah Child, whose imperial ideas foreshadowed a century before their time the great events which were to make the English masters of India, resolved to press the claims of his Company to a larger share of the trade of the Further East. He was unable, indeed, to recover Bantam in

¹ Vol. I.; Oxford, 1888.

Java (which had for a time been the London East India Company's chief spice and pepper factory), owing to the intrigues of the Dutch, but the expedition sent for that purpose in 1684 founded a factory at Bencoolen in Sumatra, protected by Fort Marlborough, which became eventually the nucleus of the East India Company's establishments in the Further East. He made vigorous efforts to open up a profitable trade with China and Japan, but there likewise the Dutch were before him and a long time was to elapse before the English traded on an equality with the Dutch in those distant seas. Batavia, the capital of the Dutch Indies, was better placed than Calcutta or Madras to control the trade to the Further East; and the English writers in the beginning of the eighteenth century describe in bitter terms the relentless opposition of the Dutch to all their efforts to establish themselves in their rival's sphere of influence. It was true that the Dutch and the English were allies in Europe and fought side by side against France in the War of the Spanish Succession; but at that very time appeared Hall's *History of the Barbarous Cruelties and Massacres committed by the Dutch in the East Indies*, a little book which had a wide circulation and exerted considerable influence at the time of its publication in 1712. The English free merchants or "interlopers," as they were officially termed, made great inroads on the monopoly of the Dutch trade in the Further East, as well as on that of the chartered English merchants, as can be seen from the pages of that most entertaining of interloping sea-captains, Alexander Hamilton, whose *New Account of the East Indies*, published in 1727, is full of narratives of his successfully outwitting both Dutch and English officials. During the first half of the eighteenth century, the interlopers carried on the brunt of the fight with the Dutch, while the East India Company's station at Bencoolen was harassed from Batavia and prevented from making adequate returns for the capital expended for its maintenance. But the middle era of the century witnessed a change in the situation. The triumphs of the English in India reacted upon their position in the Further East. Clive's daring in facing responsibility, and the victory of Forde over the Dutch expedition sent into Bengal in 1759, definitely assured the predominance of the English in the Further East as well as in India, and when Warren Hastings came to the helm of the East India Company's affairs in India, a fresh effort was made to use the recognized power and prestige of the Company's government to expand the volume of English trade in the Malay Peninsula, in the Spice Islands and in China seas.

It would be tedious to narrate in detail the various early attempts made by the East India Company to secure what it

considered its fair share of the trade of the Spice Islands during the seventeenth century. The only accurate statement of these efforts is to be found in a publication by the India Office, which is in the form of an official report and does not pretend to be an historical narrative. Nevertheless Mr. F. C. Danvers has compiled a work of the greatest historic value, in his *Report to the Secretary of State for India in Council on the Records of the India Office: Records relating to Agencies, Factories, and Settlements not now under the Administration of the Government of India*, published in 1888. Mr. Danvers in this report has given a classified list of all the documents touching his subject preserved in the India Office, with a brief summary of the information they contain, so that it is now possible for any student who desires to trace the history of the East India Company in Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Cochin China, China or Japan to find out exactly what assistance he can obtain from the papers preserved at the India Office. Mr. Danvers indicates in his summaries the difficulties under which the factory at Bencoolen suffered from the enmity of the Dutch, the various unsuccessful attempts made by the Company to form settlements in the island of Borneo, and the methods pursued in prosecuting trade with China and Japan. The curious practice of confiding the charge of the China trade to the care of the "supracargoes" of the different ships sent in the annual fleet to Canton, who were to meet in committee and live at the Company's expense while purchasing Chinese commodities for the European market, out of which grew the China establishment of the East India Company, is outlined as well as the various attempts to obtain admittance to other ports than Canton. Many interesting topics of this sort are suggested in the report of Mr. Danvers upon the primary authorities which will be used, it is to be hoped at no distant date, by a competent scholar.

The triumphant conclusion of the struggle with France for the predominance in India extended the sphere of influence of the East India Company to the eastern side of the Bay of Bengal. In earlier years their attempt to open trade with Burma and Siam had culminated in disaster. In 1687, the Company's servants at Mergui in Tenasserim, where a trade had been opened with the Siamese, were massacred, and a similar slaughter at Negrais in 1759 closed the attempt commenced six years earlier to open up commerce with the Burmese. But the free trading or "interloping" captains continued to carry on their venturesome business of commerce without intervention or protection of forts or factories. Through one of them, Captain Francis Light, came the first permanent settlement of the English in the Malay Peninsula. This enterprising voyager mar-

ried the daughter of the native ruler of Kedah or Queda, and proposed to Warren Hastings in the name of his father-in-law to cede an island called Pulo Penang, off the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, to the East India Company, in return for a pension of six thousand dollars a year.¹ Warren Hastings had too much to do in saving the English in India to conclude this transaction, but his temporary successor, Sir John Macpherson, seized upon the opportunity and announced to the Court of Directors of the East India Company on March 25, 1786, that the British flag had been hoisted on the island of Penang, which was in courtly fashion given the new name of the Prince of Wales's Island. Macpherson considered this acquisition one of the chief glories of his brief administration and speaks of the new settlement as "advantageous for our fleets and beneficial to the trade with China, as well as to British and Asiatic commerce."² Captain Light governed Penang until his death in 1794 and the settlement advanced in prosperity under his patriarchal administration in spite of occasional disputes with the ruler of Kedah. About the time of his death the East India Company began to take a more direct interest in the little settlement. The Protestant Netherlands had been overrun by the French, and the Batavian Republic, which replaced the former government of the United Provinces, was at once at war with England. This gave the East India Company its opportunity for revenging itself for many humiliations and for putting an end to the power of the Dutch in Asia. It is unnecessary to specify the various naval operations, which, starting from Penang and Bencoolen as their bases, placed the British in possession of all the outposts of Dutch occupation in the Spice Islands. It is enough to state that the value of Penang became more and more evident. In 1802, the governor, Sir George Leith, increased the area of the settlement by acquiring from the ruler of Queda for ten thousand dollars a year of additional pension a district on the mainland opposite the island, eighteen miles long and three miles broad, which he named after the Governor-General of India, the Province Wellesley.³ In 1805, Penang was formed into a presidency, like Madras and Bombay, with a governor and council corresponding directly with the Governor-General in India and the Court of Directors in England. Meanwhile, the outlying posts being conquered,

¹ The text of this treaty and of its successor explaining it in 1791 is in Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sunnuds relating to India and the Neighboring Countries*, Calcutta, 1876, Vol. I., pp. 302-307.

² See *The Case of Sir John Macpherson, Baronet, late Governor-General of India, containing a Summary Review of his Administration and Services prepared by Friends from authentic Documents*, August, 1808 [not published, but privately printed], p. 37.

³ Aitchison, I. 305-307.

it was resolved in 1810, by the Governor-General, Lord Minto, to complete the subjugation of the Dutch in India by the conquest of the island of Java. And now first appears upon the scene that most famous Englishman in Malay history, the future founder of English influence in Eastern seas. When Penang was made a presidency, it was resolved to send out from England a new establishment of officers for its administration. One member of this staff was a young man of twenty-four who had been for ten years an extra clerk in the India House and had there attracted the attention of one of the directors of the East India Company by his intelligence and diligence. Thomas Stamford Raffles soon gave evidence of his exceptional ability. He mastered the Malay language, became secretary to the Penang government, traveled with observant eyes through the Malay Peninsula and joined Lord Minto at Calcutta in time to aid in the direction of the expedition against Java. The English expedition was entirely successful, the Dutch lines at Cornelis were stormed by the British troops under the gallant Rollo Gillespie, and Dutch India passed into the hands of the East India Company in September 1811.¹

Raffles was appointed lieutenant-governor of Java and was given an opportunity of trying his hand at administration on a large scale. This is not the place to compare either the theory or the practice of Dutch and English administrators in Asia. It is enough to state that the whole of the Dutch system was utterly abhorrent to Stamford Raffles. It was based upon forced labor which Raffles and all other English observers have stigmatized as slavery or at the very least serfdom of the worst kind. The Dutch according to Raffles looked upon their possessions in the Spice Islands as sources of material wealth and did not regard themselves as owing any obligation to civilize or justly rule their Asiatic subjects. The problem of administering a vast agricultural community so as to allow personal freedom, self-respect and a fair share of the profits of their labor to the actual cultivators, had been honestly, if not always successfully, faced in India. Raffles applied the same ideas to Java. He abolished forced labor; he took the control of the police and of the administration of justice out of the hands of native chiefs and confided it to European officers, and by sympathetic treatment won the affection of the people of Java who had been terrorized into almost constant insurrection by the Dutch.

When the great war with Napoleon was over the English gov-

¹ The best account of the conquest of Java is *Memoir of the Conquest of Java with the subsequent Operations of the British Forces in the Oriental Archipelago*, by Major William Thorn, London, 1815; see also Lady Minto's *Lord Minto in India*, London, 1880.

ernment resolved to deal generously with the Dutch. Selfish commercial considerations might have induced Lord Castlereagh and his colleagues in the English cabinet to retain the Spice Islands, and Raffles earnestly protested against restoring their former dependencies to the administrators who had shown so little understanding of native ideas. But considerations of European policy prevailed. The English ministry desired to make the new kingdom of the Netherlands a powerful state, and this they hoped to do by restoring to the Dutch their former possessions in the Eastern seas. The interests of the Malays were not consulted. By the order of the British government the former Dutch possessions in the Spice Islands together with the settlement of Malacca in the Malay Peninsula were restored to the Dutch in 1818, while the East India Company retained only its former settlements of Bencoolen and Penang. But the man was still in the English service whose foresight and administrative skill were to make up to the British Empire for the loss of Java, and Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, who had been knighted during a visit to England, assumed the government of Bencoolen in Sumatra in 1818. He at once perceived that the generosity of the English ministers had given the Dutch a fresh opportunity, not only to hamper English trade with the Spice Islands, but even to control the direct passage from India to China through which the commerce of the Further East with Europe was obliged to pass. The Dutch government controlled the straits between Sumatra and Java and made preparations as soon as they had regained their former dependencies to arrange with the rulers of Johore and Rhio for control of the narrow passage between Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula. Raffles at once appealed to the Marquis of Hastings, the Governor-General of India, to avert this peril. The two English settlements of Bencoolen and Penang looked toward the West; Raffles saw that if England's commerce in the Far East was to attain its natural development it was necessary to control a passage-way to the China Sea and to establish some post that should look towards the East. For this purpose he selected the little island of Singapore, which lay off the extreme point of the Malay Peninsula. The island was almost uninhabited and eulogists of Raffles are apt to assert in the words of his biographer that it was "unknown alike to the European and the Indian world."¹ This is hardly true, for old Alexander Hamilton in his *New Account of the East Indies*, remarks: "In Anno 1703 I called at Johore on my Way to China, and he (the king of that place) treated me very kindly, and made me a Present of the Island of Singapore, but I

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v.

told him it could be of no Use to a private Person, tho' a proper Place for a Company to settle a Colony on, lying in the Center of Trade and being accommodated with good Rivers and safe Harbours, so conveniently situated, that all Winds served Shipping both to go out and come into those Rivers."¹ Raffles was as much struck with the advantages of the island of Singapore as Hamilton, and he made arrangements with the rulers of Johore for the establishment of a factory there. A treaty was signed and the purchase of the island made on February 6, 1819;² a few days later the British flag was hoisted and the settlement commenced. Singapore was at first placed under the control of Bencoolen or Fort Marlborough, of which Raffles was governor, which gave him the opportunity to have the island and its approaches carefully surveyed, and the elements of prosperity secured by wise measures in laying out the future capital of the Straits Settlements. The Dutch vehemently protested against what they termed an invasion of their rights, and the matter was referred to the home governments in Europe. After long diplomatic negotiations it was arranged that the English should abandon Bencoolen, thus leaving the whole island of Sumatra to the Dutch, while the Dutch on their side gave up Malacca on the Malay Peninsula, the former capital of the Portuguese in Eastern seas, to the East India Company. It was further agreed that the control of the Peninsula should belong to the English and of Sumatra and Java to the Dutch, which prevented either nation from excluding the other from the direct passage to the China Sea. The treaty³ embodying this important arrangement was signed on March 17, 1824, about a month after Sir Stamford Raffles had sailed from Asia for the last time.

The treaty of 1824 was followed by important measures of administrative concentration. Hitherto Penang and the Province Wellesley had been governed as an independent presidency corresponding with the Court of Directors, governed by a governor and council appointed in England, and administered by a covenanted civil service, with independent medical and other establishments similar to those existing in the presidencies of Madras and Bombay. Bencoolen or Fort Marlborough had likewise been regarded as an independent settlement, but it had never been raised to the rank of a presidency and its officials had held a somewhat anomalous posi-

¹ Ed. 1727, Vol. II., p. 98.

² See the text of the treaty in Aitchison, I. 327-329.

³ The text of the treaty is in Aitchison, I. 62-69. The important articles are the 9th, by which England cedes Fort Marlborough and engages that no British settlement shall be formed in Sumatra, and the 10th, by which the Dutch cede Malacca and make a similar engagement about the Malay Peninsula.

tion. One of the most important privileges of a presidency was that it possessed a High Court of Judicature, appointed directly from England from the English bar, which was invested by letters patent from the Crown with jurisdiction in all places and over all offences. The presidency of Penang, or as it was officially termed, Prince of Wales's Island, was too small to need a supreme court consisting of a chief justice and puisne judges, and it was therefore given a recorder's court, like that which existed at Bombay down to 1823, presided over by a single judge entitled the Recorder of Prince of Wales's Island. By the Act 5 George IV., cap. 108, the island of Singapore, which had hitherto been under Bencoolen, and the settlement of Malacca, which had been ceded by the Dutch to the English Crown, were transferred to the East India Company, and by 6 George IV., cap. 85, the Company was authorized to annex Singapore and Malacca to Prince of Wales's Island or otherwise as they might see fit.¹ Under the powers of this act the Directors of the East India Company on October 12, 1825, constituted the three settlements on the Malay Peninsula into one administrative government, to consist of a governor and three resident councillors, one of whom was to reside at each of the settlements. The jurisdiction of the Recorder of Prince of Wales's Island was extended and the Supreme Court of Judicature in each settlement was to consist of the recorder, the governor and the local resident councillor. A member of the Madras civil service, Mr. Robert Fullerton, was appointed governor, and the Company's officials formerly employed at Bencoolen were transferred to the service of the new government. Although Singapore rapidly advanced in prosperity the expense of the administration of the three settlements in the Malay Peninsula was so great that it was speedily resolved to reduce the status of the government. Lord William Bentinck, who had been sent out to India as Governor-General in 1828 on a mission of economy, carried out the reduction. The capital of the Malay settlements and the seat of the recorder's court were removed from Penang to Singapore in 1830; the separate civil service and other establishments were abolished; and the control of the settlements was confided to a resident at Singapore, who was made directly subject to the Governor-General of India and who was deprived of the status and salary and the privilege of communicating with the Court of Directors, which the governor had enjoyed. The former establishments of the Prince of Wales's Island presidency were amalgamated with those

¹ *An Analysis of the Constitution of the East India Company and of the Laws passed by Parliament for the Government of their Affairs at Home and Abroad*, by Peter Auber, London, 1826, pp. 257-259, 382.

of Bengal, but it is worthy of note that the civilians who administered the government of the Malay settlements down to the end of the Company's existence were men who had been members of the old Prince of Wales's Island service, who had joined that establishment on coming to Asia, and who were therefore trained from the beginning of their career to a knowledge of Malay habits and customs and a perfect acquaintance with the Malay language.

The laws administered in the Malay settlements were the regulations of the government of India which had been in force when Prince of Wales's Island was made a presidency in 1805, amended by the regulations made in the presidency itself, by its governor in council. After 1830 all legislation remained in the hands of the Governor-General of India in Council; local regulations could be made by the resident at Singapore but had to be submitted to the Governor-General for confirmation. The recorder remained the chief judicial functionary, but magisterial powers were exercised, as in India, by the local officials who combined the functions of collecting the revenue and maintaining the peace. So large had been the staff of the former presidency that for many years no new covenanted civilians were needed and their clerical assistants were imported from the Madras presidency, while police duties were performed by Malays, officered by Europeans. The normal garrison for several years consisted of two regiments of Madras native infantry, although the general government was superintended from Bengal, for the Madras sepoys showed none of the objections to crossing the Bay of Bengal which characterized their Bengal brethren; and officers in the Madras army, who, when in garrison, took the trouble of learning the Malay language, were often detached from their regiments and appointed to administrative offices. Problems of administration were extremely simple in Penang and Malacca, from both of which places commerce soon departed to the better situated settlement at Singapore. In them the control of affairs was entrusted to officials termed resident councillors. Their main duties were to superintend cultivation, to improve it by introducing new staples, to collect the land revenue after the method in India, to do justice in patriarchal fashion and to lead the Malay cultivators into paths of industry. Their chief interest was in exploring the mainland beyond the limits of the little British provinces and their chief excitement, disputes with occasional hard fighting against the neighboring Malay chieftains.

In Singapore however the situation was entirely different. The almost uninhabited island soon became, as Raffles had foreseen, a commercial centre of great importance. Its safe harbor made it the

natural stopping place of all ships sailing to China and it also became an entrepôt of island commerce, to the entire overshadowing of the Dutch capital at Batavia. From the very beginning Singapore had been declared a free port and since no customs dues were ever levied the trade of the Philippines, of Borneo, of Siam and the Moluccas converged to it. The advantages for trade were quickly observed by the Chinese, who flocked to Singapore in large numbers, and the control and management of the Chinese population presented features of peculiar difficulty to the British officials. The more ambitious among them, like Mr. S. G. Bonham, devoted themselves to the study of the Chinese language and the mastery of Chinese habits and customs, to the great advantage of the service of the state when the First Chinese War resulted in the possession by Great Britain of a Chinese dependency. The special foreign problems that faced the Singapore administration were the management of relations with the rulers of Johore, from whom the island had been purchased, and the necessity of taking measures to deal with the pirates who infested the neighboring seas and gravely interfered with the development of commerce. The government of India had almost reduced to a science the art of dealing with native rulers, and by alternate threats, concessions and the exertion of personal influence the successive early residents at Singapore, Mr. Ibbetson, Mr. Murchison and Mr. Bonham, managed to keep the peace with their neighbors of Johore and to avoid the necessities of war and annexation. The pirate difficulty was of more importance, and it was not until after the outbreak of the First Chinese War that the home government perceived the necessity of dealing with this evil by commencing a systematic attempt to put down piracy by the use of ships of the Royal Navy.

The imperial value of Singapore was first made evident during the war with the Chinese which began in 1841. It was at Singapore that the fleet and military expedition made their rendezvous, and Singapore was the real base of operations throughout the three campaigns that followed. The naval and military commanders all bore witness to the excellence of the harbor of Singapore; the accumulation of supplies there greatly increased the prosperity of the settlement, and it was at this time that this out-lying post of the dominions of the East India Company first became familiarly known to the English people. This is not the place to examine the causes or to trace the history of the First Chinese War. But it is necessary to notice briefly the relations of the East India Company with China and how and when those relations had been broken off, in order to show how it was that England's dependency of Hong

Kong was never under the control of the East India Company and was from the first administered as a crown colony. In the eighteenth century the East India Company possessed the monopoly of Chinese as well as of Indian trade, and many efforts were made to found some factory on the Chinese coast which could be held permanently for the collection and storage of cargoes for the annual shipment to England. The story of the obstinate resistance of the Chinese authorities to the settlement of an English factory belongs to the general history of the commerce of China with Europe. Owing to the impossibility of forming a factory the China trade of the East India Company was conducted from 1715 to 1770 by the supercargoes of the different ships sent to China, who were directed on arrival at Hong Kong to keep a common table and to act in harmony in fixing prices. The Chinese government prohibited trade elsewhere than at Canton, where a corporation known as the Hong merchants was formed to deal with the supercargoes for the management of foreign trade. In 1770 the East India Company resolved that the supercargoes should permanently reside in China instead of going to and fro on their ships as they had formerly done, and a regular establishment was formed resembling the mercantile staff of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay from which the covenanted civil services of the three Indian presidencies had grown. It is curious to note in the titles of the Company's civil officials in China traces of their origin. Whereas down to 1840 the civil servants in India, though rulers and judges, were still divided officially into the four classes of senior merchants, junior merchants, factors and writers, so in China the Company's servants were denominated until the break-up of the China establishment as supercargoes and writers. The governing body of the supercargoes was known as the Select Committee, and the president of the committee corresponded directly with the Court of Directors of the East India Company and was entirely independent of the Governor-General of India. The China establishment of the East India Company were not permitted for many years to reside on Chinese soil, and they therefore made their residences in the island of Macao, which belonged to the Portuguese and was situated in the mouth of the Canton River. Their work was easy and lucrative, and appointments to the China establishment were invariably given by the Directors of the East India Company to their own immediate relatives. Their duties were to provide for the Company's investment in China and they never became like their colleagues in India a service of statesmen and rulers. The most exciting events in the history of the Company's China establishment were the embassies sent by the English government to

the Chinese emperor in 1793 under Lord Macartney and in 1816 under Lord Amherst. There were the usual troubles caused by free merchants interfering with the Company's monopoly and certain special and curious difficulties caused by the persistent prohibition of the Chinese government against the residence of European women in China. In 1813 the East India Company's monopoly of trade with India was abolished, but the monopoly of China trade was continued for a further period of twenty years.

The protest of the English merchants, however, made itself loudly heard, and the first reformed Parliament in 1833 abolished the monopoly of the China trade. The greater part of the former China establishment of the East India Company was transferred to the Bengal civil service, when the abolition of the monopoly was finally accomplished in 1834, and the home government had to appoint an imperial official, Lord Napier, as "superintendent of trade," in order that there might be some one with authority to deal with the corporation of the Hong merchants. Captain Charles Elliot succeeded Lord Napier in 1836, and during his tenure of office the events occurred which led to the outbreak of the First Chinese War. One of the most important results of that war was the cession to Great Britain of the island of Hong Kong. This dependency was from the very first classed as a crown colony and governed directly through the Colonial Office. Its first three governors were indeed servants of the East India Company, for Sir Henry Pottinger was an officer in the Bombay army, Sir John Davis a member of the former Chinese establishment, and Sir George Bonham a successful resident at Singapore, but they had none of them during their government any direct connection with India. It was their experience in the Company's service, however, which made them the successful administrators of the new possession. The laws and local regulations which they put into force closely resembled those which had proved successful at Singapore; they drew their administrators mainly from India, until an effective Hong Kong civil service had been brought into being, and in particular they made Hong Kong, like Singapore, a free port, and imitated the Singapore trade regulations. While admitting, therefore, that the administrative history of the dependency of Hong Kong is distinctly differentiated from that of the Straits Settlements in that it owes nothing directly to Indian influence, it may yet be said that it could hardly have been so immediately and entirely successful had it not had Indian example to guide it and Indian administrators to watch over its growth. The problems of Hong Kong were those of Singapore over again, without the complications arising from the mixture of Chinese and Malay inhab-

itants, and the way in which those problems have been met in such manner as to create two flourishing Asiatic dependencies, commanding two strategic points and controlling vast commerce, has reflected credit upon the administrators formed in the great school of the East India Company. It should be added that in Hong Kong, as in Singapore and India itself, care was taken to separate the supreme judiciary authority from the administration, so that there should exist to deal with important cases and in appeal from administrative officers exercising magisterial functions an entirely unbiassed court, consisting of a judge or judges appointed from the English bar, which could control unjust administration by its legal knowledge and complete independence.

It cannot be said that the Chinese War or the annexation of Hong Kong were in any way due to the British occupation of Singapore, although that occupation simplified the military and naval operations; it was otherwise with the expansion of British power in the island of Borneo, which was the direct outcome of the struggles entered into with the Malay pirates as Singapore became more and more the centre of the island trade. The treaty with the Dutch of 1824 declared that "no British establishments shall be made on . . . or on any of the other islands south of the Straits of Singapore, nor any treaty concluded by British authority with the chiefs of those islands."¹ The island of Borneo lies partly to the south of the Straits and the Dutch appealed to this treaty to prevent British extension there. This had its weight undoubtedly in preventing the direct extension of British power on that island, where it was left to a British subject and to a British company to establish sovereignty. Yet many attempts had been made by the East India Company during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to establish factories in Borneo, and the failure of these factories had been due as much to the persistent opposition of the Dutch as to the ferocity of the Malay inhabitants. It is worth noting that in the sixteenth century the Portuguese had from their capital at Malacca exercised considerably more influence over Borneo than their successors the Dutch had ever done from Batavia or the Spaniards had effected from the neighboring Philippines. The language of the natives abounds in words derived from the Portuguese,² while the Dutch and the Spaniards have made but little impression upon the minds of the people. It was from Borneo that the most daring pirates of the China Sea set out to prey upon all passing commerce, and spasmodic efforts were made by ships of the Indian

¹ Aitchison, I. 67, Article II of the treaty.

² Information derived from Mr. Charles Hose of the Rājā of Sarāwak's service.

navy after the occupation of Singapore to suppress this piracy.¹ But the Singapore government itself could do little in this direction and the first vigorous efforts were made by an English adventurer, the celebrated Rájá Brooke.

James Brooke² was the son of a distinguished member of the Bengal civil service and was an officer in the Bengal army from 1819 to 1830. In the year in which he left the army he first visited the Straits Settlements, and in 1838, attracted by the prospects there, he sailed from England on a personal adventure in a ship owned and commanded by himself. It was his deliberate purpose to introduce British ascendancy into Borneo, and he soon established a remarkable reputation and obtained an extraordinary influence over the Malay and Dayak inhabitants of that island. This led the Sultan of Brunei, the chief native ruler, to confer upon him the nucleus of the present state of Saráwak with the title of Rájá in 1842. It is not necessary here to deal with the romantic life of Rájá Brooke in Borneo; it is enough to note that his experience led him to abolish forced trade and every sort of slavery and to establish in its place a simple system of administration. He dispensed justice among his people in patriarchal fashion and won their affection. He was exceedingly desirous from the very first to make it clearly understood that he was not instigated by personal ambition, but that he wished to use his authority to extend British influence and to ameliorate the lot of the natives. He co-operated heartily with the officers of the Royal Navy in suppressing piracy³ and induced the Sultan of Brunei in 1846 to cede to the British government the little island of Labuan at the mouth of the Saráwak River as a commanding point for operations against the pirates and as possessing coal mines which might be usefully worked. He was himself the first governor of Labuan, and he trained there and at Saráwak many men who learnt from him the management of Malays, among whom perhaps the most distinguished was the present Sir Hugh Low. Close communication was naturally maintained between the British dependency of Labuan, the independent state of Saráwak and the East India Company's settlement at Singapore,

¹ *History of the Indian Navy*, by C. R. Low, *passim*.

² For the biography of Rájá Brooke, see *Life of Sir James Brooke, Rajah of Saráwak*, by Sir Spenser St. John, London, 1879, and *An Account of Rajah Brooke*, by Gertrude L. Jacob, London, 1876.

³ See *The Expedition to Borneo of H. M. S. "Dido" for the Suppression of Piracy*, London, 1846, and *A Visit to the Indian Archipelago in H. M. S. "Mæander"*, London, 1853, by Capt. the Hon. (now Sir) Henry Keppel; *Narrative of the Voyage of H. M. S. "Samarang," 1843-46, in the Eastern Archipelago*, by Capt. Sir Edward Belcher, 1848; and *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes down to the Occupation of Labuan*, by Capt. (afterward Sir) George Rodney Mundy, London, 1848.

although the three were under entirely different authorities. Rájá Brooke found the Chinese as inevitable and as difficult to handle in Saráwak as successive governors found them at Singapore. They were the only people of commercial aptitude and therefore outwitted the more backward Malays. Trade on anything like an extensive scale was only possible through Chinese agency. Yet neither Brooke nor any of the English administrators liked the Chinese. Their secret societies banded them together against the authorities whenever they disapproved of any tax or police measure. They were not amenable to the arguments which could be effectively applied to savage and uncivilized races. They were clever enough to combine against anything of which they disapproved and the forces of European civilization were unable to influence them. In 1857 the Chinese of Saráwak made an attempt to murder Rájá Brooke and his English associates ; he saved his life with difficulty and recovered his authority only by the fidelity of the Malays and Dayaks.

During the period in which Rájá Brooke was establishing himself in Borneo and the British administration at Hong Kong was being placed upon a permanent footing under the Colonial Office, the Straits Settlements of Singapore, Penang and Malacca continued to be governed from Calcutta as part of the territories of the East India Company. Experience had shown that the best method of dealing with the troublesome Chinese question was to inspire the leaders of the Chinese mercantile community with confidence in the administration and to use them to control their brethren. One old gentleman in particular, named Whampoa, fills a large place in the records of the time as the representative Chinaman and as the confidant of the governor in all Chinese questions. Still more serious for the protection of trade was the question of dealing with piracy. To the east of Singapore this matter was dealt with mainly by ships of the Royal Navy, aided by Rájá Brooke ; in the Dutch islands the Dutch ships co-operated ; but the government of the Straits Settlements had to do the work for itself along the Malay Peninsula. The Malays were daring and inveterate pirates and the government at Singapore was first brought into contact with the various native states in the Malay Peninsula by negotiations for the suppression of piracy. A series of treaties was made with the different native states for this purpose, of which the most important was signed with the Sultan of Perak on October 18, 1826, by which the Sultan ceded to the East India Company the territory known as the Dindings, including the island of Pangkor, a district containing about two hundred square miles, eighty miles to the

south of Penang and celebrated as a pirate haunt.¹ The negotiations with these Malay chiefs were carried on by officers who had the experience of the government of India to go upon, and although it was not then considered expedient to appoint residents to the native states the way was paved for that policy. The most serious difficulty that arose during these varied negotiations was as to the question of the sovereignty of these petty rulers. It was only after many treaties had been entered into that it was discovered that the King of Siam possessed a sort of shadowy supremacy over the whole Malay Peninsula. This led to long and complicated negotiations with him and to the sending of many embassies to Bangkok, of which the most important were those of Mr. John Crawford in 1821, Capt. Henry Burney in 1826 and Sir James Brooke from Saráwak in 1850.

The great Bengal Mutiny of 1857 did not affect the prosperity of the Malay settlements, for the regiments in garrison at Penang and Singapore belonged to the Madras army, which was not implicated in the insurrection. But as a result of the Mutiny the East India Company ceased to exist, and all its dominions passed to the British Crown. The Malay settlements for a time continued to be governed from Calcutta and in 1861 the last Indian officer was appointed to administer the dependencies. By this time the line of civilians who had originally been trained in the old Prince of Wales's Island civil service had died out and the last of them, Mr. E. A. Blundell, sent in his resignation. The subordinate posts had long been held by Bengal civilians, or by officers detached from the Madras army who had learnt the Malay language while stationed with their regiments at Penang or Singapore. The governor appointed in 1861 had however not previously been employed in the Malay Peninsula. He was Colonel Orfeur Cavenagh, an old Bengal officer who had lost a leg at the battle of Maharájpur and had done good service during the Mutiny as town- and fort-major of Calcutta. It so happens that Cavenagh was inspired towards the end of his long and useful life to publish a small volume which he entitled *Reminiscences of an Indian Official*.² In this book he gives a full and interesting account of his administration of the Malay settlements, abounding in quotations from documents and in personal anecdotes. An animated description is given of his management of the Chinese at Singapore, of his annual tours to Malacca and Penang, of his intercourse with the Dutch, of his visit to Saráwak and of his experiences with the Siamese. It is fortunate for students of the history of the British settlements in the Malay Peninsula that

¹ Aitchison, I. 310, 311.

² London, 1884.

there exists such a volume as Cavenagh's *Reminiscences*, and reference can safely be made to it for a striking and faithful picture of administration in that part of the world thirty years ago. He boasts of the proved value of Singapore to the Empire during the Second Chinese War and prides himself on the growth in its prosperity during his government. Like other Indian officers he had a very poor opinion of the Dutch administration in the neighboring islands, which he declares to be based on wrong principles. "Although Holland honestly strives," he says, "to improve the material condition of the native races under her rule, her yoke is heavy, and they are denied the blessings of real freedom. Some day they may discover her weakness and their own strength. Her empire in the East may be compared to a bow too highly strung; should the cord once snap there would be a complete collapse."¹ This prophecy has not yet come true, but the long and bitter wars that the Dutch have been forced to wage against the Achinese in Sumatra have more than once imperilled their authority. One other quotation upon the character of the Malays may be made from Cavenagh's book, because it gives such a different point of view to that of those observers who regard the Malays as a race of treacherous pirates, and because it illustrates the universal endeavor of English administrators to promote education. "The Malays," he says, "in many respects resemble my own countrymen" (Cavenagh was an Irishman); "they are quick-witted, easily excited, ready to undergo any amount of fatigue in the way of sport or amusement, but not, as a rule, much given to steady labor, and greatly under the influence of their priests. Knowing this last circumstance, when I commenced the introduction of elementary education, wherever the village priest was qualified I placed him at the head of the local school. He consequently became a supporter instead of an opponent of the government, and it was a priest who, in the first instance, increased the number of his scholars by the presence of his own daughter, and was pleased at the notice her cleverness attracted. His example was followed by others and there were three or four schools where boys and girls received instruction in the same classes."²

In 1866 it was resolved to transfer the Malay dependencies from the superintendence of the government of India, and the Straits Settlements were formed into a crown colony administered directly from the Colonial Office, like Hong Kong and Labuan. There was much to be said in favor of this important administrative change. The problems of administration were different from those in India and it was a little absurd that the legislation necessary for the Malay

¹ Cavenagh, p. 340.

² Cavenagh, pp. 262, 263.

settlements should have to pass under the supervision of the government of India. There are some experienced British administrators in Asia who would go a step further and who would remove Burma from the control of that government in consideration of the fact that the Burmese people differ in race and religion from the peoples of India, and who would make a separate vice-royalty of Burma and the Malay Peninsula, giving, perhaps, the administration of Ceylon instead to the government of India. At any rate it must be admitted that the Malay settlements have owed much to the wisdom and devotion of their Anglo-Indian administrators, and that when they were handed over to the Colonial Office they were transferred in a flourishing condition, with a fine staff of officials and splendid traditions of administrative duty. By the Act 29 and 30 Victoria, cap. 115, the government of the Straits Settlements was formed on the model of that of the other crown colonies, with a governor aided by an executive and a legislative council, with a Straits Settlement civil service, vacancies in which were filled by public competition, with a High Court of Justice consisting of a chief justice and two puisne judges, appointed from the English bar, and with a garrison directly under the control of the War Office. The act took effect in the following year. Colonel Cavenagh was somewhat ungraciously superseded without any official notification and on April 1, 1867, the first of the new governors, Major-General Sir Harry Ord, took up his appointment.

The change in the position of the settlements on the Malay Peninsula from being subordinate to the government of India into the crown colony of the Straits Settlements led to many important developments in both internal and external policy. The lines of development indeed had been laid down by the East India Company's officials, but the imperial officers who succeeded them had a more direct interest in the colony as a part of the British imperial system. One of the chief reasons for the change of status was the recognition in London of the commercial and strategic importance of Singapore. Even before Colonel Cavenagh was superseded a commission had been sent out, of which the most important members were Sir Hercules Robinson and Colonel Sir William Jervois, to report upon the defences of Singapore, and it is worthy of note that the first colonial governors of the Straits Settlements, Sir Harry Ord, Sir Andrew Clarke and Sir William Jervois, were all officers of the Royal Engineers. Under their supervision an elaborate system of fortification was undertaken the expenses of which were defrayed out of the colonial revenues. Although the garrison maintained at Singapore consists of only one regiment of British infantry,

with details of artillery, engineers and submarine miners, the importance of its situation is thoroughly recognized and it forms the essential link between British interests in the Indian and the China Seas.

The imperial governors, though at first mainly occupied with the question of military defence, were not blind to the necessity of encouraging commerce, and because in the nature of things the continued prosperity of the province of Singapore depended upon the management of the Chinese a regular Chinese department was established with a branch at Penang. Certain officers of the Straits Settlement civil service, who showed special ability in mastering the Chinese language and special aptitude for dealing with the Chinese settlers, were detached for this department, and the office of "Protector of the Chinese" was created. It was realized that a special training was necessary for effectually dealing with Chinamen, and the creation of a special Chinese department, trained to keep track of the working of the Chinese community with its secret societies, its peculiar habits and extraordinary powers of combination, greatly simplified the management of the Chinese problem. Perhaps it may not be thought egotistic in the present writer here to remark that the present Protector of Chinese in the Straits Settlements is an old school-fellow, Mr. G. C. Wray, who even as a school-boy gave promise of a distinguished career alike by his ability in learning languages and by his skill in managing boys. Experience has amply shown the advantage of a special Chinese department if an Asiatic dependency like Singapore is to derive commercial advantages from the industry and intelligence of Chinese merchants, while controlling and checking the various dangerous and criminal proclivities of their compatriots.

In dealing with the Malays the chief difficulty bequeathed to the colonial government of the Straits Settlements by the East India Company was the relation between the British patches of directly governed territory and the independent Malay states which surrounded them. It has been already pointed out that the East India Company's governors and residents entered into negotiations with many of these states for the purpose of suppressing piracy. There had been more than one petty war, and it was felt to be highly desirable that definite relations should be established. This was not done by annexation. The example of India had shown that it was both more economical and more consistent with the legitimate national aspirations of the people, to recognize and control native rulers than to abolish them altogether and annex their territories. The example of Dalhousie's government of India has had a whole-

some effect on English policy in the Malay Peninsula. The governor who first attempted to deal with the problem of the Malay native states as a connected whole was Sir Andrew Clarke, who in the year 1874 signed treaties with the Malay states of Perak, Selangor and Sungei Ujong by which the rulers of those states entered into relations with the government of the Straits Settlements, not unlike those entered into by the feudatory states with the government of India, binding each native ruler to accept the presence of a British Resident who should advise the ruler as to his duties. This loss of independence, for however disguised it might be, the presence of a British Resident did diminish the importance of the native ruler, led to an outbreak in Perak. The British Resident, Mr. Birch, was murdered at the instigation of the Sultan in 1875, and military operations had to be undertaken. The campaign, which was directed by General the Hon. Francis Colborne, was short and brilliant. The advance was led by the First Gurkha Regiment, which penetrated the fastnesses of the Malay kingdom, and Capt. G. N. Channer won a Victoria Cross for a deed of exceeding daring in turning the enemies' most formidable line of defence. The Sultan surrendered and was deported. But the country was not annexed ; a relative was placed upon the throne and from that time on the control of the Malay states through British Residents has been the rule throughout the Malay Peninsula.

Sir Frederick Weld, who governed the Straits Settlements from 1880 to 1887, continued the work of spreading the British protectorate over the native Malay states by bringing under the control of British Residents the confederated states of Negri Sembilan in 1886 and the important state of Pahang in 1887. In each of these native states British government was introduced in the names of the respective rulers by officers of the Straits Settlement civil service. The collection of the revenues was revised so as to be just and enlightened instead of arbitrary ; public works were undertaken on an extensive scale ; forces of police were established for the maintenance of the peace ; sanitary regulations were enforced ; and the native rulers were trained by the British Residents in modern ideas of administrative efficiency. But the national pride of the Malays was not as much injured as it would have been by annexation, and their religious fanaticism was not outraged by the overthrow of their Muhammadan sultans and ancient native dynasties. In 1895 the states of Sungei Ujong and Negri Sembilan were amalgamated under a single British Resident and in July 1896 an important step was taken for the promotion of administrative harmony. A treaty was signed between the four protected states, forming a federation under

the general control of a Resident-General, and the federated states agreed to furnish troops for colonial service in case of war. The governor of the Straits Settlements was further given the office of High Commissioner of the Federated States and his position was assimilated to that of the governor of Cape Colony, who is also High Commissioner for South Africa, and of the governor of Fiji, who is also High Commissioner for the Western Pacific. The credit of acquiring the control of the Malay Peninsula with the least possible friction to native sensibilities belongs partly to the successive governors of the Straits Settlements, but they would be the first to admit that their success was mainly due to the exceptional knowledge of the Malay character possessed by well trained and experienced officials like Sir Hugh Low, the pupil and friend of Rájá Brooke, who for forty years was the most efficient administrator and agent of civilization among the Malays, and Sir Frank Swettenham, the present Resident-General in the Malay Protectorate.

A word must be added about the native state of Johore which lies between the Malay Protectorate and Singapore. The sultans of this state ever since the cession of Singapore have made their chief residence in the island and have become semi-Europeanized, to the adoption, indeed, it is said, of European vices as well as European virtues. The state is administered on British lines and, although not technically, is practically a protected state. It is not necessary here to enter into the details of the various treaties made with the state of Johore, which are complicated by the rival claims to sovereignty of the sultan and a chief entitled the Tumangong; it is enough to state that in 1887 the treaty was signed by which all foreign relations of the state of Johore were confided to the government of the Straits Settlements.

The friendly relations established in the days of the East India Company between Singapore and Saráwak have been maintained since the control of the Straits Settlements passed from the East India Company to the Crown. In 1868 Rájá Brooke died and was succeeded by his nephew the present Rájá, who is in England Sir Charles Johnson Brooke. The second Rájá has followed the policy of his famous uncle and administered his state not so much for private profit as for the extension of the prosperity of his subjects. The state of Saráwak has steadily expanded with the consent of the British government through cessions made by the Sultan of Brunei, and the second Rájá of Saráwak now rules over a territory of 41,000 square miles, containing a population of over 300,000. The policy of taming the Dayaks of Borneo has steadily proceeded and their most objectionable practices, such as piracy and head-hunting,

have been checked. The officers of the Rájá of Saráwak have been active in reclaiming to civilization his savage subjects, and have done this without forcing upon them too rapidly the ideas of Europe. It is the practice of the rájá to entrust his officials with wider power and larger responsibility than is done by the government of the Straits Settlements, and with the happiest results. This is not the place to narrate the fascinating tales told to the present writer by Mr. Charles Hose, a member of the Saráwak civil service. This able officer is perhaps better known as a naturalist and explorer than as an administrator. His identification of the flora and fauna of the mountains of Borneo with that of the Himaláyas has proved that Borneo belongs to the Asiatic and not to the Papuan system. His travels have done something to open up the unknown interior of the island and his mastery of the Malay character has enabled him to obtain a degree of personal influence over his people which may be expected to lead to further results. As the Saráwak state has increased its borders and become more prosperous, the Chinese difficulty has continued to grow. Wherever towns are established as centres of trade and seats of government the Chinese come, and the difficulty of keeping the peace between them and the Malays is very great. With regard to the position of the Rájá of Saráwak it is to be noted that he possesses all the attributes of internal sovereignty. He arranges the collection of his revenue, including among its sources, somewhat to the indignation of purists, gambling licenses; he issues his own stamps; and he legislates for his dominions. He governs with the assistance of a council consisting of his chief English officials and certain leading natives, and his territories are divided up into districts governed by officers termed "residents," who perform judicial as well as administrative functions. There is no supreme court of justice in Saráwak; appeals are heard by the Rájá in council, and in this respect may be seen a marked difference from the administration of the Straits Settlements. A further distinction is to be noted in the fact that the Rájá's police force consists entirely of Malays, and that he does not, like the government of the Straits Settlements and the North Borneo Company, import Sikh police from India. By a treaty signed on June 14, 1888, the state of Saráwak was officially placed under British protection. The Queen's government undertook not to interfere with the internal administration, but was given the power to determine any question that might arise as to the succession to the throne, to control all foreign relations and to establish consuls, while the Rájá of Saráwak agreed on his side not to alienate or to annex any territory without consent from London. To fulfil the duties of the protectorate thus assumed

by England the governor of the Straits Settlements for the time being is appointed to act as High Commissioner over English territory in the island of Borneo.

The protectorate of Borneo includes besides Saráwak the territories administered by the British North Borneo Company. This company, which received its charter of incorporation on November 1, 1881, was the first of the new chartered companies which have during the last few years been extending British influence in various parts of the world. The revival of companies with governing powers as a part of the British system of expansion forms an interesting chapter of recent history. It would of course be absurd to compare the British North Borneo Company to the famous East India Company, but some of its contemporaries in Africa seem likely to reproduce in another continent the work formerly accomplished in Asia. The British North Borneo Company arose out of certain grants of territory made by the independent sultans of Brunei and Sulu to Mr., now Sir, Alfred Dent in 1877 and 1878. It is a proof of the changed ideas of the last half-century that Mr. Dent, instead of administering the territory granted to him personally, as Rájá Brooke did, preferred to make over the territory to a company formed for the express purpose of exploiting it. The powers of the Company are carefully laid down in its charter and the home government consists of a Court of Directors, eight in number, elected by the stockholders. The company is not commercial but governing, and its profits are derived entirely from administrative sources. It is prevented by its charter from becoming the possessor of a commercial monopoly, and its trade is freely thrown open to all merchants complying with its regulations and paying fixed custom duties. After the company had shown its capacity for effective government in North Borneo the British government entered into closer relations with it, and on May 12, 1888, a formal protectorate was declared over the North Borneo Company's territories under which all the foreign relations of the Company were transferred to the Crown, while it was declared independent in all matters of internal administration. A further step was taken to bind the Company and the Colonial Office more closely together in 1889. In that year the island of Labuan, which was too small to justify an independent colonial government and which had failed to fulfill the hopes of Rájá Brooke as an outpost of British trade, was handed over to the British North Borneo Company. It was agreed that the governor of British North Borneo should be likewise governor of Labuan, and the Colonial Office was relieved of the expense of the island dependency.

The administration of the territories of the British North Borneo Company is based upon the ideas in practice in the Straits Settlements rather than upon those of Saráwak. The first officials came from the Straits Settlements, which may account for this fact. The territories are divided into nine provinces, each under the control of a Resident, who exercises the powers of the resident councillors at Penang and Malacca, which greatly resemble those of the Collector of an Indian district in that they are both administrative and magisterial. At the head of the administration is the governor, who is not aided by a council, as in Saráwak, but is made directly responsible for the good order of the territories to the Court of Directors in London. The Company derives its revenue from import duties, stamps, a poll-tax and the sale of land. It has its own coinage and postage stamps, but it does not issue licenses for gambling or resort to some of the other methods of obtaining revenue which are adopted in Saráwak. The most striking difference of the two Borneo governments is to be seen, however, in their police systems. The first governor of the British North Borneo Company's territories, Mr. C. Vandeleur Creagh, was originally an officer in the Punjab police and made his reputation by raising in 1867 the Sikh police force, which was then introduced into the island of Hong Kong. When he was transferred from Hong Kong to the Straits Settlements in 1883 he showed his belief in the efficiency of Sikh police by raising a similar force for service in the protected native state of Perak. He pursued the same policy in North Borneo, where the maintenance of the peace is confided to a force of about 300 Sikhs under the command of English officers. The officials of the Rájá of Saráwak are opposed to the use of Sikhs in their districts. They assert that the natives of India cannot deal successfully with the natives of Borneo, and they prefer to rely upon Malay and Dayak policemen raised and trained by themselves rather than upon foreigners. Without pronouncing upon this controversy it is worth noting that there has been more than one serious outbreak in North Borneo, in which British officers have lost their lives, whereas peace has reigned throughout the government of the second Rájá of Saráwak.

The consideration that naturally suggests itself after this brief summary of the administrative evolution of the British dependencies in the Further East is the absence of any harmonious idea in the extension of British power or in the manner in which it is administered. For two hundred years various efforts were made by the East India Company to establish trading settlements in the Spice Islands, but spasmodically and without method. The rivalry of the

Dutch hindered their success, and in haphazard fashion, in order to save its existence amidst the anarchy which followed the break-up of the Mughal Empire and under the pressure of rivalry from France which threatened extinction to its trade, the East India Company laid the foundation of the British power in India rather than in the Further East. Considerations of European policy led the British in India to occupy the Dutch possessions in the Further East during the Napoleonic War, but a sentiment of generosity dictated by European political considerations caused the return of these Dutch possessions to their former owners in 1815. The temporary occupation of the Spice Islands had opened a vista of trade and power in the Further East. The English statesmen and merchants did not realize their opportunity, but a true builder of empire appeared in the person of Sir Stamford Raffles, and Singapore was chosen as the nucleus of future British development. The treaty of 1824 left the English supreme in the Malay Peninsula and prevented the Dutch from closing the path to the China Sea. Slowly, as a dependency of the East India Company, the free port of Singapore became one of the central points of the Asiatic trade. Further extension was the work in China of the British government and in Borneo of individual Englishmen. The First Chinese War gave to England the island of Hong Kong, while the same decade saw the foundation of the principality of Sarawak, and forty years later the British North Borneo Company undertook independently the extension of Rájá Brooke's work in the island of Borneo. The whole story of extension illustrates the haphazard way in which the British Empire has been built up, and is a further proof that the extension of that empire has been the work not of far-seeing statesmen, but of the support by the government of individual energy.

The administration of the dependencies in the Further East bears the marks of their historic evolution. The law administered in the Straits Settlements is the common statute law of England as it was in 1826, when the separate Prince of Wales's Island government or presidency ceased to exist, modified by acts passed by the government of India up to 1867, when the Straits Settlements, as an independent entity under the Colonial Office, was empowered to legislate for itself. The Indian penal code with slight local modifications has been adopted and there is a civil procedure code based on the English judicature acts. In Hong Kong, where the East India Company never held sway, Indian precedents and statute laws have no authority, and the English common law is the basis of the legal system, modified by the laws passed by the colonial legislative authority. In British North Borneo, the Straits Settlements law

has been adopted with slight amendments, while in Saráwak the code enforced is simpler and its administration more patriarchal.

Although the law administered differs, and the systems of administration show marked divergences, the men who govern the natives in the Straits Settlements, in Hong Kong, in Saráwak and in British North Borneo come from the same class and are trained in the same traditions and ideals. Entrance to the civil service of Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements is obtained after a competitive examination open to all subjects of the Queen, and in subjects intended to attract candidates from the great English schools and the universities. The examination is now the same as that for the Indian covenanted civil service, and the young man who wins an appointment has won for himself a career in life. On joining his appointment in Asia, he at once receives a salary of \$1500 and is set to work to learn the native language. On passing in the languages, he is attached to some branch of the service, and begins his administrative work under the instruction of an experienced official. He is tried in various places and positions to discover his aptitudes, and if he be intelligent and industrious, he rises to high and well-paid official positions. At the expiration of his allotted term of service, he retires with a liberal and well-earned pension. The prospect attracts men of marked ability. Young Englishmen of the middle or professional classes have more liking for administration than for business. Many of them have had relatives in various branches of the Indian and colonial services for many generations and possess hereditary traditions of service in the East. The open-air life, the love of sport and travel, a real liking for the details of governing backward peoples, attract them to enter the service; and once in it, enthusiasm develops their powers. British North Borneo and Saráwak draw their officials from the same class, but without competitive examination, and it sometimes happens that they obtain the services of excellent men who possess all the necessary qualifications, but who have not been able to stand the strain of competitive examination.

The system is not ideal in itself—what government of Asiatics by Europeans is likely to be?—but it may be asserted that the British system in the Further East, as in India, is the result of long experience, and that the officials form a body of highly trained administrators sprung from the very flower of English manhood, selected without fear or favor, promoted only after proof of efficiency, and looking upon their career as the means not only of gaining an honorable livelihood for themselves, but also of promoting, to the honor and glory of England, the extension of Christian civilization in the Further East.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

THE CONNECTICUT LOYALISTS

AT the beginning of the War for American Independence Connecticut occupied a phenomenal position in the political hemisphere. For nearly a century and a half she had been an independent republic *de facto*. In her ability to govern herself she stood pre-eminent among her sister colonies of the Revolutionary period. Her treatment of threatening internal ills—of Toryism¹ in particular—was prophylactic in character at the outset; in truth, throughout the entire great struggle, tory-germs of civil disorder were rarely suffered to develop beyond the embryo.

The party of the Loyalists was not lacking in men whose principles command respect. Of this class was he whose conservatism led him honestly to fear anarchy and confusion as a result of the so-called "experiment" in popular self-government. But it may be questioned why even such a man should have been found a "Non-Associator" in the stable little republic, whose people had governed themselves wisely and well for more than a hundred years.² Unlike his brethren of other provinces, he was not to be frightened at the alternative presented where there was no legislature; where royal governors, after subverting assemblies, had themselves abdicated their authority; where the "officious and offensive" grasped the reins of government, for which, it was urged, "they could adduce the laws of neither God nor man."³ This plea was not valid in Connecticut. She had not then, and had never had, demagogues at the head of her affairs.

"In no state in the world," observes President Dwight, "was an individual of more importance as a man than in Connecticut. Such a degree of freedom was never before united with such a de-

¹ "Probably no one of the thirteen original states was as active, alert and efficient in the restraint of Tories during the war, as our own state of Connecticut." Jonathan Trumbull, in *Year-Book (1895-6) of the Connecticut Sons of the American Revolution*, 183. Cf. Sanford's *Connecticut*, 222.

² The Connecticut pioneers were firm believers in representative democracy. "By a free choice," said Hooker, "the hearts of the people will be more inclined to the love of the persons chosen, and more ready to yield obedience." *Notes to Hooker's Sermon* (May 31, 1638). Cf. *The 250th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Constitution*, published in January 1889 by the Connecticut Historical Society, p. 45.

³ Cf. Dr. G. E. Ellis's "The Loyalists and their Fortunes," in Winsor's *America*, VII. 191.

gree of stability ; or so much individual consequence in all the members of a community with such cheerful and uniform obedience to its laws. Few places in the world," he believes, "presented a fairer example of peace and good order."¹

The outbreak of hostilities brought no upheaval here in the leadership of affairs. The governor and both branches of the legislature worked together in harmony, and, being chosen by the freemen themselves, were enabled to legislate favorably to the popular will. The people understood their privileges, were strongly attached to their ancient constitution, and defended it at all times. They regarded it as their native, indefeasible right to be subject to no laws except those made by their own representatives. Their bitterest detractor, Rev. Samuel Peters, says, satirically, that "the multitude considered their General Assembly to be equal to the British Parliament." He admits that "they were empowered to make laws in Church and State agreeable to their own will and pleasure, without the King's approbation."²

The constitution³ had been formed and adopted by the freemen in person, as early as January 1639 ; acceded to and ratified, twenty-three years later, by the liberal charter of Charles II. Extensive powers were vested in their own elected governor and council ; yet so jealous were the people of their liberty that, if the former failed to call the legislature after being petitioned by the freemen, then the constables of the several towns were to convoke the legislature, which body could choose a moderator to act as governor, and the body thus formed had all legislative authority. Such an emergency, however, never arose : the governor and members of the assembly had all served their apprenticeship at town meetings, had held some town office, and, proving satisfactory, had been promoted to their respective positions. They were themselves from and of the people, and appreciated the people's needs. So pervasive was the democratic spirit that even the negroes of the colony (who, in 1774, numbered about six thousand) had become infected, and for several years elected their governor annually—continuing to do so for a time, it is said, after the close of the war. Not to be outdone by their masters the blacks treated their sable executive with profound respect, and he never failed to receive the honorable title of "Governor" when addressed by any of his colored constituents.

¹ Dwight's *Travels*, I. 196, 285-286.

² In the Charter of 1662, Charles II. retained no veto power.

³ "It is worthy of note that this document contains none of the conventional references to a 'dread sovereign' or a 'gracious King,' nor the slightest allusion to the British or any other government outside of Connecticut itself." Fiske's *Beginnings of New England*, 127-128. Neither was there any mention made of the English company, holding a patent of the land.

At the beginning of the war there were six counties and seventy-two townships in the state. Each county had its sheriff and judges, built and repaired its own court-houses and jails, and taxed itself for that purpose. Every town had its three or more selectmen (frequently seven), two or more justices of the peace, two or more constables, town clerk, town treasurer, surveyors of highways (sometimes a score in number), fence-viewers, listers, collectors of taxes, leather-sealers, grand jurors, tithingmen, hay-wards, chimney-viewers, gaugers, packers, sealers of weights and measures, key-keepers, recorders of "sheep-marks," etc. Including state, county and town officials there were at least three thousand men holding public office in the state, each of whom had sworn to do his duty conformably to its constitution and laws. The selectmen were the executive officers of the town, and, like all others, were elected annually at the town meetings by the voters themselves.

These seventy-two townships were so many little republics,¹ where, at the annual meetings, the people were early schooled in the art of self-government, and where they learned to protect themselves from their enemies. Here their legislators and local officers first learned to do public business, and to do it peaceably and in good order. It was an old and established law that, if a person interrupted or disturbed the order, peace or proceedings of a town meeting, or hindered the choice of a moderator, or vilified him after being chosen, he should be subject to a fine.² None spoke without leave, and all without interruption. It was well understood, too, that it was for the general interest that every voter should attend. As early as 1702 an act was passed ordering town clerks to keep a list of all the freemen in each town, and at every meeting the clerk or a constable was to call the roll. Absentees were to pay a fine of two shillings (collected by a constable and disposed for the use of the town), unless such delinquent could make it appear to the majority of the selectmen that his absence was unavoidable.³ A large proportion of the people held public office at some time or

¹ "The most noteworthy feature of the Connecticut republic was that it was a federation of independent towns, and that all attributes of sovereignty not expressly granted to the General Court remained, as of original right, in the towns." Fiske's *Beginnings of New England*, 127-128. For opposing views, cf. *The Beginnings of Connecticut Towns*, by Professor Charles M. Andrews, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 7.

² Act of May 1729, in *Colonial Records*, VII. 245.

³ Act of October 1702, in *Colonial Records*, IV. 398. In the Hartford town records of 1635, appears the following: "It is ordered that there shall be a set meeting of all the townsmen together the first Thursday in every month, by nine of the clock in the forenoon . . . and whosoever of them do not meet at the place and time set, shall forfeit 2s. 6d. for every default."

other, all were employed in promoting the general interests of society, and a general spirit of good neighborhood prevailed among all classes. Thus, to use the words of another: "The little federal republic silently grew until it became the strongest political structure on the continent."¹

It will be perceived that, at the dawn of the American Revolution, the exponent of anti-republican principles was bound to be accounted, in Connecticut, little less than a political monstrosity. Any person here at this period who held the opinion that the people were unable to govern themselves, was looked upon with a feeling akin to contempt by his fellow-citizens and treated accordingly. Unfortunately patriotic resentment subsequently led to excesses² in sporadic instances and probably caused, in the minds of some, apprehensions as to the outcome of the popular movement. Others became "conservators of peace" solely because they feared the strength and resources of the British realm; they believed that the colonies, already enjoying extensive privileges under her government, were needlessly and futilely seeking a separation. A few professed to be dissatisfied because the General Assembly was more arbitrary than the Parliament itself; while one economically-disposed individual boldly declared that the Continental Congress "ought to be punished for putting the country to so much cost and charge," for he believed "they did no more good than a parcel of squaws."

But it will be found, on due investigation, that Toryism in Connecticut was less secular than sectarian in character; that it was chiefly the outgrowth of jealousies and fears begot by strong religious prejudices. The determined opposition on the part of the people and their representatives (who were mostly Congregationalists) to the introduction into the province of Episcopacy with a foreign prelacy induced the body of the Churchmen to embrace the cause of the Crown, believing that only in the event of success to the British arms could they, as the weaker party, hope for encour-

¹ Fiske's *New England*, 128.

² In one or two instances some irresponsible persons took the law into their own hands and perpetrated acts not sanctioned by the better class of Whigs. In Simsbury one Tory was shot for being found beyond his own premises--after having been "warned." Another was publicly hanged in Hartford, and the gallows left standing to intimidate other Tories. Phelps, *Newgate of Connecticut*, 28. In Windham, two men, known as "Peter's Spies," who had been arrested for conveying treacherous correspondence, were forced to *run the gauntlet* between two rows of women and children armed with switches and broom-sticks. Larned's *Windham County*, II. 136. For the treatment of the notorious Churchman, Rev. Samuel Peters, cf. *id.*, II. 133-136. Rev. Mr. Leaming, the Episcopal clergyman at Norwalk, was also the victim of a gross outrage at the hands of a "lawless mob." Cf. Beardsley's *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 316 (Boston, 1865).

agement and permanent religious security—an alternative, in which ecclesiastical principles prevailed over the sentiments of the patriot. Moreover, the score of Episcopal clergymen here were stipendiaries of the English Missionary Society. Hence, unlike many of their brethren at the South,¹ (who generally derived support from those to whom they ministered), they “conceived the measures of the colonies to be unwise, if not unjust, and destined to end either in defeat or ruin on the one hand, or the overthrow of the Church on the other.” As faithful “Missionaries” they deemed it a moral obligation, imposed upon them by their oath of allegiance taken at the time of their ordination, to pray for, and give homage to their “Most gracious Sovereign Lord, King George, and the Royal Family.” Through frequent observance of this rubrical formula and respect for pastoral injunctions, the laity of the church became, in turn, duly and piously impressed with the divine rights of the King and the sanctity of his royal prerogative. So eminent an advocate and historian of the Church as Dr. Eben Beardsley believes, that “it speaks well for the influence and Christian character of the Episcopal clergy [in Connecticut,] that their congregation so generally sympathized with them in their views both of religious and civil duties;” that “they inculcated upon their members, both from the pulpit and in private conversation, a peaceful submission to the King and to the parent state;” that “they were fearless in avowing and vindicating what they conceived to be not only the essential rights of the British Crown, but the essential interests of their venerated communion;” that, as a consequence, the Churchmen throughout the colony “espoused for the most part the cause of the mother country, and thereby showed themselves loyal subjects of the King.” Out of 130 families who attended divine service in his two churches, Rev. Richard Mansfield of Derby reported (December 29, 1775), 110 to be “firm, steadfast friends of the Government,” having no sympathy with the popular measures and detesting the “unnatural rebellion.”²

¹Episcopacy was more firmly established at the South; being supported by the wealthy, the officials of government, army and naval officers, professional men and merchants. There was evidently some laxity of discipline, both clergy and laity opposing for temporary reasons the importation of English bishops. Not being pensioners of the foreign missionary society, the Southern clergy felt more free to share the patriotic sentiments of the people; and some of them, in truth, proved themselves ardent patriots by serving actively in the field. Cf. Perry's *History of the American Episcopal Church*, 1587-1883, I., Chap. XXIV.

²Beardsley's *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 306-339. Cf. Davis's *Wallingford and Meriden*, 248. Dr. Beardsley states that “there was just a score of clergymen of the Church of England in Connecticut at the outbreak of hostilities,” all but two of whom were natives of the colony.

Judging from the census of 1774 there were in that year twenty-five thousand¹ males in Connecticut between the ages of sixteen and fifty, and of these about two thousand were Tories—most of them in the western part of the state, especially in Fairfield county.² This marked localization of Loyalist sentiment west of the Housatonic river has been commonly attributed to “the remoteness of this part of the colony from Boston and its almost exclusive trade with New York.”³ But while this may explain satisfactorily why the distant section did not participate so strongly “in the incipient spirit of the Revolution,” it does not adequately account for the prevalence of Toryism *per se*; for which organic social ill some more subtle moral agency will be suspected, and the essential facts are not wanting to prove such suspicion well-grounded.

It was a common apprehension in Connecticut prior to the Revolution that the growth of the English Church was hostile to civil and religious liberty and favorable to the ultimate establishment of a “monarchical government with a legally associated hierarchy.” In consequence of this general alarm, a “Convention of Delegates” of Congregational divines from all parts of the colony appointed, at their annual meeting, a committee to investigate the subject. Acting as their agent, the Rev. Elizur Goodrich of Durham made an “accurate and toilsome collection of statistics” relative to the number of Episcopalians in Connecticut and their proportion to Non-Episcopalians. In closing his report,⁴ September 5, 1774, Mr. Goodrich makes the Episcopalians about one in thirteen of the total number of inhabitants. But, says Dr. Beardsley, “nowhere in the colony, according to his estimates, was the church so strong as in Fairfield county, where it embraced about *one-third of the people*,”⁵ while at Newtown—the hot-bed of Toryism—there was found an equal division (“1084 in either case”). Rev. John Beach, pastor in

¹ In *Records of Connecticut Men in the War of the Revolution*, 27,823 different names are indexed, and it is thought that 30,000 may have served. See p. xi.

² The principal Loyalist towns were Newtown and Redding. From a “Memorial to the General Council of Safety” (February, 1778), signed by the selectmen of Redding, it appears that 49 Tories in that town had “gone over the enemy;” that 28 Whigs were serving in the Continental Army; and that 112 “able-bodied men” were left. The Churchmen of Newtown were, in 1779, the major part of the population; and the Tories slightly outnumbered the Whigs.

³ Hinman’s *Connecticut in the American Revolution*, 18.

⁴ *Minutes of the Convention of Delegates from the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, and Associations of Connecticut, 1766–1775*, p. 62, Appendix, (Hartford, 1843.) After 1763, the English bishops incessantly pressed upon the ministry the adoption of Archbishop Secker’s scheme of introducing an Episcopal hierarchy into America, which would have carried with it some of the worst features of the prerogative. Gra-hame’s *History of the United States*, IV. 138.

⁵ Beardsley’s *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 289.

this latter town and one of the most energetic Loyalists in the state, continued the public exercise of his ministerial functions¹ throughout the war, protesting "that he would do his duty, preach and pray for the King till the Rebels cut out his tongue." He also presided over the church in East Redding, and was instrumental in organizing the famous "Association of Loyalists" at that place. Near the close of the war (October 31, 1781), he penned an exultant epistle to the secretary of the "Home Society" that "Newtown and the Church-of-England part of Redding were, he believed, the only parts of New England that had refused to comply with the doings of Congress."² While it is evident, therefore, that of the Loyalists throughout the colony the churchmen of Fairfield county constituted a majority, nevertheless there were some who did not venture to become, like certain of their pastors, conspicuously active in their opposition to popular measures, and they may, perhaps, with some propriety be classed among the so-called "conservators of peace."

Patriotic spirit kindled to a blaze in Connecticut in the summer of 1774. Every loyal citizen was filled with indignation over the unjust treatment of his friends in Massachusetts. Special meetings were held in nearly every town, at which resolutions were passed censuring the Boston Port Bill; the timid and ignorant were informed of their rights and grievances; committees of correspondence were appointed, "Sons of Liberty" organized, and "liberty poles" erected throughout the state. Rigorous measures were speedily

¹ His brother pastors had discontinued their public prayers by vote of the Convention at New Haven, July 23, 1776.

In concluding his letter of October 31, 1781, Mr. Beach wrote: "I do most heartily thank the Venerable Society for their liberal support, and beg that they will accept this, which is, I believe, my last bill, viz., £325, which, according to former custom, is due." During the war, says Dr. Beardsley, (I. 318), "a generous collection, *by royal order*, was made in England and sent to be distributed among the score of Missionaries in Connecticut." The latter "were not disposed," adds he, (336), "to forfeit their stipends from the English Society . . . while the struggle was still undecided, and the prospects for the colonists so doubtful." "If there were a few instances," says he, (339), "where the flocks were more patriotic than their pastors, the reason for this might be found in the difference of their relations to the Society."

² In the autumn of 1775 the selectmen and principal inhabitants of Newtown were prevailed upon to give a bond, with a large pecuniary penalty inserted, not to take up arms against the colonies, as well as not to discourage enlistments into the American forces.

Ridgefield, by vote of her town meeting, December 1774, had also protested against the acts of the Continental Congress. She fell heartily into line the succeeding year, however (December 1775), and appointed her Committee of Inspection, composed of twenty-six members. Rev. Epenetus Townsend was pastor of the English Church in this place; and it is a significant fact that, though many members of his flock were prominent villagers, but one of them is mentioned anywhere in the town or state records as having participated in the patriotic movement, local or otherwise. See list of church members in Teller's *Ridgefield*, 113-127.

adopted to search for and crush out the noxious spirit of disaffection. Yet, except in a few aggravated cases, the Tories were at first treated merely as social outlaws. The following resolution of the people of Coventry is a fair sample of most of the others passed at this time: to wit, "We view with grief and detestation those unnatural enemies of our constitution, from amongst ourselves; those vile *anathemas*, who, from motives selfish and servile, to court arbitrary promotion, or servilely to cringe to despotic sway, are affording their aid and assistance to, and co-operating with the ministerial tools of arbitrary power: (they) are unworthy of that friendship and esteem which constitutes the bond of social happiness, and ought to be treated with contempt and total neglect."¹

It was soon found that resolutions of this kind were likely to prove inadequate. The battle of Lexington had not yet been fought, it is true, but it was deemed expedient, in view of a probable war, to know how each man stood affected: whether his feelings were enlisted in the liberal cause, or whether he secretly disapproved of rebellion against British authority. One of the most effectual preventives of an incipient Toryism at this time, was administered through Committees of Inspection, appointed at town meetings in all parts of the state. These were a body of representative men, fifteen to thirty² in number, from each town, who usually met at the court house for the ostensible purpose, it is said, "to take effectual care that the acts of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, be absolutely and bona fide adhered to." But it was as a committee of vigilance that their chastening influence was more specifically felt. If any individual fell under the suspicion of the people, (and this was of daily occurrence), "the Committee were immediately notified, and they forthwith repaired to the person and demanded an avowal of his sentiments." They instituted a patriotic and searching espionage into the principles, actions, and private affairs of every member of the community, without regard to station, profession, or character. If one was found to be lukewarm or indifferent, he was closely watched; but, if a royalist in sentiment, he was forbidden to go beyond the limits of his own farm, while in the meantime his name

¹ The several towns of Litchfield county (February 1775) recommended to the people of their county that "all persons who endeavored by any means or ways to sow the seeds of discord, should be treated with that utter contempt that such criminals justly deserve." Cf. Hinman's *Connecticut*, 51. The people of Lebanon passed similar resolutions, as early as July 18, 1774.

² The Committee of Inspection of New London (appointed June 27, 1774) numbered thirty persons, any seven of whom constituted a quorum. Caulkins's *New London*, 503. In Hartford, the Committee had fifteen members. Cf. Trumbull's *Hartford County*, I. 306.

was to be published conspicuously in capital letters on the first page of one or more of the four newspapers of the colony, thus: "PERSONS HELD UP TO PUBLIC VIEW AS ENEMIES TO THEIR COUNTRY, J—— H——;" giving place of residence, etc.¹

The Committees of Inspection were subsequently recognized by the Governor and Assembly as being most efficient agents for restraining insidious foes. They were not only considered equal in authority to the selectmen and civil officers of the town, but were legally qualified to issue warrants for arrest, etc. In this manner became early established a comprehensive police system, by which the whole state was kept constantly active for the detection of traitors. As the majority² of the members of the legislature were themselves Sons of Liberty and town-meeting men, they appreciated fully the necessity of co-operating with the local authorities in their efforts to stamp out this evil; and, in the spring of 1775, committees were appointed to investigate the various cases reported from the towns concerning suspected Tories.³ In April, the Assembly passed an act recommending to the two hundred parish ministers of the colony, that the cause of liberty be favorably mentioned in their public prayers.⁴

In the fall of the year it was felt that more stringent measures were required: that, as the welfare of the people was jeopardized through the hostile influence of Tories, they, like other criminals, should be debarred from society. The Congress itself (October 6, 1775), advised the several provincial assemblies "to arrest and secure every person, who, going at large, might in their opinion endanger the safety of the colony or liberties of America." Washington held strong views on the subject, and a month later expressed himself to Governor Trumbull, as follows: "Seize the Tories that are active; they are preying on the vitals of the country and

¹The four newspapers of the Revolutionary epoch, all strongly patriotic in sentiment, were the *Connecticut Gazette* of New London, the *Connecticut Courant* of Hartford, the *Connecticut Journal* of New Haven, and the *Norwich Packet*.

²Col. Storrs, a member from the eastern section of the state, writes in his "Diary," April 27, 1775,—"Bad weather for Tories in the House; yet we have some." Larned's *Windham County*, II. 148.

³A "Memorial" from Waterbury showed, that the "major part" of a militia company of that town were thought to be "inimical;" and the "true Whigs" prayed to be annexed to a new company. A committee of two was at once appointed to examine into the case and report at the next Assembly. Act of April 1775, in *Colonial Records*, XIV. 433.

⁴*Colonial Records*, XIV. 434. At a parish meeting in New London it was put to vote, that no person be permitted to enter the church and act as pastor to it, *unless* he openly prays for Congress and the free and independent States of America, and their prosperity by sea and land. Caulkins's *New London*, 447.

will do all the mischief in their power.”¹ That the governor was of the same opinion is evidenced in a letter written shortly afterward to his son Joseph, wherein he says: “It is of the utmost importance to secure the malignants in every colony, to prevent our enemy gaining any footing on the continent, or receiving supplies, assistance, or intelligence. Let us show a determination to enjoy liberty and freedom while we live, and not suffer hypocritical friends, who seek our ruin, to wheedle and cajole us.”²

Both branches of the legislature were *en rapport* with the governor and Congress on this point, and at the special session held at Hartford, December 14, 1775, passed an act entitled, “an act for restraining and punishing persons inimical to the liberties of this and other of the united colonies.” In order that the punishment should fit the crime, the Loyalists were divided into the following three general classes:

1. Those who directly or indirectly supplied the enemy with provisions or military stores; or gave or conveyed intelligence to the enemy; or enlisted, procured or persuaded others to enlist, in the service of the enemy; or took up arms against the colonies; or undertook to pilot any vessel of the enemy; or knowingly and willingly aided the enemy in any other way whatsoever;
2. Those who by writing or speaking, or by any overt act, defamed the resolves of Congress, or the acts or proceedings of the Assembly respecting their rights and privileges;
3. Those reported to the local authorities as “inimical.”

The Loyalist of the first class was to forfeit his estate, and to be imprisoned, the term not exceeding three years. He of the second class was to be disfranchised, could keep no arms, and serve in no civil or military capacity; and, if thought necessary, he was to be imprisoned or fined, and to find surety of the peace as the court might order, and pay cost of prosecution. He of the third class must appear before the selectmen or Committee of Inspection of his town, by whom he would be disarmed until such time as he could prove his friendliness to the liberal cause; and if he refused to be disarmed, the civil authorities could order the sheriff to call out the county militia for assistance. It was further enacted that, on information being made to the county court by the selectmen of any town that there were real estates in such town owned by any Loyalist of the first class, the said court should issue warrants and attach the property and place it in the care of some proper person to im-

¹ Washington to Trumbull (November 1775), in Stuart's *Life of Trumbull*, 220. Cf. Washington to Trumbull (January 7, 1776), in Ford's *Washington*, III. 324.

² For similar sentiments, see Deane to the Committee of Secret Correspondence (October 1, 1776), in Wharton's *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution*, II. 160.

prove it for the use of the colony, and account to the latter for the rents. The state treasurer was empowered to make sale of all such lands, either at public vendue or by private sale, as he judged would conduce most to the benefit of the colony, and to execute deeds accordingly.¹

Early in the ensuing year (January 2, 1776) Congress again recommended "the most speedy and effectual measures to frustrate the mischievous machinations and restrain the wicked practices of these men;" that "they ought to be disarmed, the dangerous kept in safe custody, or bound with sureties for good behavior." Connecticut had already lived fully up to this doctrine; nevertheless complaints began to come in from the various towns, concerning the misdeeds of Tories who were still left at large.² The governor and council were not deaf to these memorials and, at the regular session held at Hartford June 14, 1776, it was enacted that the goods of every "inimical" person should be seized and sold for the benefit of the colony; also, that he who owed such a person money, should be factorized by the selectmen for the benefit of the colony; *i. e.*, the debtor was to pay the selectmen, who would be compensated for their trouble and hand over to the state treasurer the various sums collected. If any individual said that he was not satisfied that the colony was justified in these measures, a committee was at once appointed to investigate his case, and if upon examination he proved to be "inimical," he was treated accordingly.

The patriot nerve-of-distrust had now become morbidly sensitive, mere whisperings of Loyalist intrigue exciting general apprehension. No slight commotion ensued at Hartford, therefore, when it was learned that the negro-governor Cuff (who had held his position for ten years) had recently resigned his high office, and, without waiting a general election, appointed as his successor John Anderson—a black servitor of the elder Skene, governor of Crown Point and Ticonderoga. This latter prominent official had been arrested in June 1775, at Philadelphia, as a Loyalist, and sent by Congress to Connecticut, where, for the past year, he had resided with his family at West Hartford, a prisoner-at-large, under parole. It was feared that Governor Skene had, himself, manipulated the political wires, securing this appointment of his servant in order to gain per-

¹ *Colonial Records*, XV.; and Hinman's *Connecticut*, 195-196.

² The following extract is taken from the *Connecticut Courant*, of May 20, 1776. "A gang of Tories has been discovered in the neighborhood of Fairfield, taken and imprisoned. . . . If these internal enemies are suffered to proceed in their hellish schemes, our ruin is certain; but if they are destroyed, the power of Hell and Britain will never prevail against us. Rouse then, my countrymen, search out the nest of these vultures, and bring them to the punishment they merit."

sonal influence over the blacks of the colony with reference to some future hostile movement. Governor Trumbull and the Council of Safety at once took the matter into solemn consideration and appointed a committee of investigation, who, in turn, invoked constabulary aid. After a careful examination of Governor Skene's private papers, and taking the testimony of several witnesses, Hon. Jesse Root, chairman of the committee, submitted to the General Council (May 22, 1776) an elaborate and detailed report, to the effect; that Ex-Governor Cuff had been advised by some of his colored friends to resign in favor of Anderson; that Governor Skene had given his servant a half-joe "to keep election;" that the latter had, himself, expended the sum of £25 in treating his would-be subjects; and that two British officers had contributed fifty shillings toward defraying the expenses of a dance and entertainment. It was apparent to the Council that nothing of a very dangerous tendency had been discovered, and that the whole affair was, probably, merely a compliment to the liberal New York negro from his admiring, but less affluent Connecticut brethren. The excitement attending this interesting though somewhat irregular election seems to have shortly blown over, and it is supposed that the new governor subsequently performed the duties of his office to the satisfaction of all concerned.¹

Three months after independence was declared by Congress, Connecticut became a state of the Union, when her legislature made the following characteristic announcement: "This Republic is, and shall forever be and remain, a free, sovereign and independent State, by the name of Connecticut." Henceforth (in accordance with an act passed by the Assembly, October 1776) any Loyalist of the first class found within her borders, would be convicted of high treason, and sentenced to death. At the same session it was further enacted, that if any one shall have knowledge of any persons

¹ Cf. Trumbull's *Hartford County*, I. 305, and Hinman's *Connecticut in the American Revolution*, 31-33. See also *Virginia Gazette*, July 8, 1775.

Governor Cuff tendered his resignation at Hartford, May 11, 1776. The following is his farewell address: "I Governor Cuff of the Negro's in the province of Connecticut do Resine my Governmentshipe, to John Anderson Niegor Man to Governor Skene. And I hope that you will obeye him as you have Done me for this ten years' past. when Col. Willis' Niegor Dayed I was the next. But being weak and unfit for that office do Resine the said Governmentshipe to John Anderson."

The governor-elect accepted his appointment in the following terms:

"I, John Anderson, having the Honour to be appointed Governor over you I will do my utmost endevore to serve you in Every Respect, and I hope you will obey me accordingly.

John Anderson, Governor over the Niegors in Connecticut."

"Pomp Willis," "John Jones," "Fraday," and others, were "Witnesses present."

endeavoring to join, or endeavoring to persuade or induce others to join, aid, comfort, or assist the enemy in any way whatsoever, *and shall conceal the fact*, "he shall be punished by fine, and imprisoned at the judgment of the Superior Court, in any gaols of the State, not exceeding three years."¹

It will be seen that it served the personal interest and safety of every citizen at this period to become an informer. That few failed to act as such is shown in the number and character of the memorials that came in to the Assembly from nearly every town in the state. The people of the shore-towns, especially, were loud in their complaints of Loyalists, who would cross to Long Island and return in considerable parties to prey upon their respective communities.² To repress this evil, the Assembly resolved that "no person in a sea-port town, should under any pretense depart from any port, harbor, bay, creek, river, or other place in the State, in any boat, skiff, canoe, etc., without a written license from one of the selectmen of the town from which he should depart;" and the various small craft were all to be drawn up in some convenient locality.

The following spring (May 8, 1777) an act still more extensive in scope was passed, which decreed that no person should pass from town to town (except well-known friendly people and military men), without a written permit signed either by a justice of the peace, army officer, selectman or committee of inspection, certifying where the bearer was going, where he came from, and reputed him to be friendly. Every suspect was seized and examined, and, if without such a permit, was arrested with or without a warrant and brought to trial before a justice of the peace, when, if found guilty, he or she was bound over on good behavior, or committed to jail until delivered by process of law. All were to aid in capturing such persons, or render themselves liable to a fine; and to prevent any evasion of the law, night watches were kept in nearly every town in the state, by which all the chief roads and passes were strictly guarded.

¹ *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776-8), I. 4. Mr. R. H. Phelps, in his *Newgate of Connecticut*, 40-41, relates the following incident of Rev. Roger Viets, Episcopal pastor at Simsbury: "At midnight some men, who, it afterwards appeared, were eluding pursuit, called at his house and asked for charitable aid. Lodging he dare not give them. Food he could not refuse. The authorities heard of it, became suspicious, and he was accused. He did not deny the charge. He was fined, and condemned to imprisonment in Hartford jail." But, according to the *State Records*, Mr. Viets was afterwards released on parole; and he is said to have preached Toryism to the Newgate prisoners. Another Loyalist minister, Simon Baxter, also preached ardent sermons at the Newgate mines. Cf. *Bew's History of Connecticut*, 175.

² "A sloop captured (bound to New York); carried to Fairfield, with several Tory passengers and committed to gaol. Three other vessels captured with 13 absconding Tories on board." *Connecticut Courant*, June 6, 1777.

At this same session (May 1777) the legislature passed an Act enjoining it upon all freemen to take the "Oath of Fidelity," and prescribing its form.¹ No person in Connecticut could hereafter exercise any office, civil or military, or vote in any town, society or other public meeting legally appointed, or plead in any court (except his own case), until he had taken this oath in open freemen's meeting in his own town, administered by a justice of the peace, town clerk or the selectmen; and the names of all freemen were to be enrolled. Furthermore, it was enacted (October 1777) that no inhabitant of the state, or the United States, who was "inimical," or who neglected or refused to take the oath of fidelity, could hold, purchase or transfer real estate in Connecticut, without special license from the General Assembly; any other conveyance to be null and void.²

It was practically impossible in Connecticut for any Loyalist literature to obtrude itself before the public eye. In August 1777, it was reported that a pamphlet, entitled *A Discourse upon Extortion*, which contained insulting reflections on civil government, was in the press at Hartford. As it was soon to be printed and scattered among the people, the Assembly ordered a warrant, directing the sheriff of Hartford County to seize said pamphlet and all copies thereof and deliver them to the state attorney, who was to inspect them and pursue advisable measures.

To dwell further upon legislative enactments of this character, would be supererogatory. It must be observed from those already cited, that that man was indeed a clever dissembler³ who could entertain views inimical to the American cause and escape the wrath

¹ "You, A—— B——, being by the providence of God an inhabitant of this State of Connecticut, do swear by the name of the ever-living God, that you will be true and faithful to the Governor and Company of this State, and the constitution and government thereof as a free and independent State; and whensoever you shall be called to give your vote or suffrage touching any matter which concerns this State, you shall give it as in your conscience you shall judge will conduce to the best good of the same, without respect of persons or favor of any man: So help you God." *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776-8), I. 227.

² *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776-8), I. 227.

³ A most remarkable case of a "clever dissembler" (recently brought to light) is that of an Irish emigrant, "Squire" William Heron of Redding; who served in the Connecticut legislature during the war, and at its close returned to his extensive farm and lived highly respected among his townsmen until his death. See Todd's *Redding*, 198. But, from "A Record of Private Intelligence" (January-July, 1781) kept by Sir Henry Clinton, it appears that the British chief employed and paid Heron as a trusted spy. Cf. *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, X. 503 and XI. 62. It would seem, however, that Heron was a double-dyed traitor, and enriched himself by serving as a spy for both sides, often bringing secret intelligence to Gen. Parsons and others. Cf. "An Examination of the Charge of Treason against Gen. S. H. Parsons," read before the Connecticut Historical Society, March 5, 1896, by Joseph G. Woodward; published in the *Year-Book* (1895-6) of the Connecticut Sons of the American Revolution, 188-210.

of the Connecticut freemen. In the western part of the state, where the Tories were of greater number, they at first attempted some mischief; but, upon receipt of memorials from several of the towns, the Assembly at their October session, in 1776, appointed a committee to repair to that section and "arrest all inimical persons and send them under proper guard to a place of safety." This was subsequently done, and many were taken captive and confined in the various towns of the interior.¹

Tory prisoners were incarcerated in nearly every gaol² in the colony; the yards of which, in many instances, were enclosed with high fences to ensure greater security. So thorough was the prison discipline, and so carefully were the inmates guarded, that few attempted to make an escape. Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey each requested the privilege of sending Tory captives here; and, in the summer of 1776, they began to arrive in large numbers (especially from New York).³ Some of them were the most influential of their class in their respective states: among others being Governor Franklin⁴ of New Jersey, Mayor Matthews of New York City, and Dr. Benjamin Church of Watertown, Massachusetts. This latter gentleman had been appointed Director of Hospitals for the East; but, being detected afterwards in treacherous correspondence with the British at Boston, he was arrested by Washington, under a resolve of Congress, and sent to Connecticut. He was confined at Norwich (November 1775), "without pen, ink, or paper, and not allowed to converse except in English and in presence of a magistrate or sheriff;" but, by an act of the Assembly (March 22, 1776), he was allowed to go out of prison (not beyond the parish limits),

¹ "A few days ago a number of Tories from New Milford and other places, were committed to gaol in Hartford." *Connecticut Courant*, May 9, 1777.

² The principal gaols were at Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Litchfield, Farmington, Norwich, New London, East Haddam, Preston, Hartford, Durham, Glastonbury, Middletown, Wallingford, Saybrook, Windham, Colchester, and the famous Newgate copper mines at Simsbury, where, in the summer of 1776, the Tory captives were between thirty and forty in number.

³ The following extracts from the *Connecticut Courant* indicate the great number of New York Loyalists that must have been imprisoned here during that year: "On Friday last (28 June, 1776), 49 Tories, taken at Johnstown, N. Y., were brought under guard from Albany to Hartford, and others were on the way."

Aug. 12, 1776. "Last week from 20 to 30 Tories arrived in Hartford from Albany, 15 of whom were to be stationed at New London."

Aug. 23, 1776. "Three vessels arrived in New London in one week from New York, with Tories collected in New York City and Long Island, who were sent into the country towns for safety."

⁴ "Gov. Franklin of New Jersey is on his way to Gov. Trumbull at Lebanon. He is a noted Tory and ministerial tool. . . . His principles, connexions, abilities and address, have rendered him a dangerous enemy to New Jersey: he is therefore removed under a strong guard to Connecticut." *Connecticut Courant*, July 4, 1776.

once a week, under a proper guard. Governor Franklin was first immured in the old gaol at Wallingford; but at the request of the citizens of that town, was afterward (fall of 1776) removed to Middletown, and finally to East Windsor. In January (1777) he asked permission of the governor and council to go home on parole, as many others were doing, promising to give bonds in surety for good behavior; but, owing to the extremity of the situation in New Jersey at that time, he was not allowed and was so informed, upon which he waxed wroth and subsequently wrote many public complaints.

The rigorous guard kept over Dr. Church and Governor Franklin was doubtless a policy both prudent and proper, since their hostile influence, if not limited in this wise, would have resulted in downright injury to the American cause. The ascription of Dr. Peters, that the Connecticut patriots were a "Puritan mob-ility," is the portraiture of a people drawn by an unfriendly hand. Whenever leniency could be shown to a Tory captive, without endangering the success of the patriot cause, it was done. In July 1776, by order of the commissary of prisoners, many were given liberty under parole to walk two miles from gaol, but were not allowed to go outside of the parish where they were stationed except by a written permit. They could occasionally send or receive letters, which were first read by the civil authorities. In August 1776, the sheriff of New London county was directed by the legislature, "to suffer the New York prisoners at Norwich to take the air one or two days each week for their health, under the sheriff's personal attendance; and to walk in the gaol-yard in the daytime, at his discretion." If in ill health, they were generally removed to a more healthful locality. Liberty was often granted, too, at this time (August 1776), for Tory prisoners to go to their homes (properly guarded) to get necessary clothing, provided they bore the expense of the journey. They were also to sign a parole of honor "not to act, do or say anything to obstruct or contravene the measures adopted by the American States to preserve freedom."

As early as the autumn of 1774—immediately after the town meetings had appointed committees of inspection and adopted resolutions of "contempt and neglect"—a few of the more sensitive of the "friends to government," who desired the respect and esteem of their neighbors, hastened to retract¹ previous utterances, and, upon

¹The confessions of 25 Tories were accepted in one day at New Milford (November 27, 1775) by the Committee of Inspection of that village. Cf. Hinman, 574.

The speech and conduct of John Stevens, the proprietor of extensive plantations in Ashford, subjected him to suspicion, as well as to an inquisitorial visitation from his

taking a solemn pledge to stand steadfast for the liberties of the people, were welcomed back into the good graces of their fellow citizens. Throughout the next two years many "inimicals" of the "second class," who had been imprisoned, were released, after having signed a full and ample declaration of the justice of the American cause, with professions of their friendship to it, and their readiness to take up arms in its defense.

It was not, however, until the summer of the following year (1777), that the Loyalists began to repent in a body and were admitted into the patriotic fold; those of the "first class" being comprehended, who had been confined and their estates confiscated, and others who had fled to the enemy. This remarkable conversion was owing principally to the following liberal act, passed by this Assembly in May, 1777. "Whereas, sundry of the inhabitants of this State, some from ill advice, others from inadvertence and mistaken apprehensions, have absconded and put themselves under the protection of the enemies of this and other States of America, but are now supposed to be convinced of their error and would probably return to their duty, had they assurance of protection, Therefore be it resolved," etc. The governor issued a proclamation assuring pardon of all treason, or misprision of treason, to those who (before August 1, 1777) appeared in Connecticut before a justice of the peace and took the oath of allegiance, and broke off all communication with the enemy, etc. Such persons should also be freed from prosecution for their offences.¹

The following case of John McKee of Norwalk is a fair illustration of the manner in which Connecticut treated scores of Loyalists at this time, who honestly desired to be restored to their former status as freemen of the state and receive the protection of her laws. In June 1776, McKee had been convicted of harboring and secreting some persons who were about to join the enemy. He had been sentenced to one year's imprisonment, and to forfeit his estate. At the expiration of the year (June 1777), he said that he was convinced of the iniquity of his conduct; was now heartily disposed to serve the American cause; and prayed that he be released and his estate restored. It was resolved by the legislature "that he return to his family and improve his forfeited estate during the pleasure of

neighbors, which resulted in the subjoined declaration, August 5, 1774. "As I, the subscriber, have talked at sundry times against the chartered rights of the colonies, I do humbly ask their forgiveness. And I further declare that I never will talk or act anything against the Sons of Liberty, but do solemnly swear that I am a true Son of Liberty, and will remain so during my natural life. In witness whereof I set my hand. John Stevens." Larned's *Windham County*, II. 130.

¹ *Public Records*, I. 254.

the Assembly, on paying such cost as may have accrued since his confinement.”¹

Ere the close of the war hundreds of Connecticut Loyalists had voluntarily made public recantations of past errors; had taken the freemen's oath in open town-meeting; and, after the payment of certain costs, the whole or a part of their forfeited estates had been restored. Some, who had early left the colony and remained active in the British service throughout, were never pardoned. Nor was this through any fault or severity of the General Assembly; for as late as May 1779, “believing that many who had fled to the enemy, were convinced of their folly, and desired to be restored to the favor of their country,” they passed a second liberal act, extending the same privileges to “absconding Tories” as had been done two years previously. But in this instance, before the governor issued the proclamation of pardon, many of these Loyalists had joined and accompanied Gen. Tryon in his infamous raid upon the defenceless shore-towns; in consequence of which the Assembly and Council of Safety subsequently voted (August 1779) not to issue the proclamation.²

The wives and children of this class, however, were treated humanely and generously; the former, whenever it was desired, being aided to join their husbands. If this was impracticable, the children (if any) were bound out to some respectable family in the neighborhood. In some cases, where the lands had been forfeited and the goods seized by the selectmen, the widow had one-third of the husband's personal property restored to her, and was granted the use of one-third of his real estate; *i. e.*, “to have and enjoy” during the pleasure of the General Assembly.³

In various towns in the southern and western section of the state town-meetings were held by citizens in the latter days of the war, and the question put to vote whether any person should be allowed to return and dwell in their midst who was previously an inhabitant of the town, but had gone over to and assisted the enemy in arms against them. This question was invariably resolved in the negative, unless such person should first obtain general permission to return. Few (especially of those who had been engaged with Tryon) ever obtained this permission,⁴ and the majority, having lost both their

¹ *Public Records*, I. 30. The following is an example of the many resolutions of the Connecticut Council of Safety. “June 13, 1777. George Follick, of Ridgefield, who was committed to the gaol in Hartford, as a Tory, shall be liberated from said prison, by paying all the costs and taking the oath of fidelity.”

² *Public Records*, II. 279 and 386.

³ See the case of Mary Hoyt of Danbury in *Public Records*, I. 299.

⁴ Cf. Hurd's *Fairfield County*, 640, for a similar vote at Ridgefield, August 9, 1779. Tories of Ridgefield, who had harbored the British on the occasion of Tryon's raid

credit and their property at home, eventually found an asylum in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. In after years some of these fugitives acknowledged and grievously lamented their mistake in having thus sided against their countrymen in the patriotic struggle for liberty.¹

It has been seen that this province was thoroughly competent to deal with internal foes ; that, while bloody scenes were enacted between Whig and Tory just over her border in the "Neutral Ground," she was enabled to prevent even the symptoms of a civil war. Though her attitude toward the Loyalists was firm and decided, it was not vindictive or revengeful. An examination of town and state records clearly evidences the fact that the governor and Assembly (and generally the freemen, too) were ready and willing to pardon the guilty and to accept repentance. As a result of this generosity hundreds of that unfortunate class retracted their hostile expressions and became loyal citizens, who otherwise would have remained hostile to the end.

G. A. GILBERT.

to Danbury, were taken by the indignant citizens to the river late at night, and treated to a prolonged "ducking."

¹Munson Jarvis, a prominent Loyalist of Stamford, wrote from St. John, N. B., (July 3, 1788), to Rev. Samuel Peters in London : "I have made one great mistake in politics, for which reason I never intend to make so 'great a blunder again." *Genealogy of Jarvis Family*, 29. For a curious "Confiscation Deed of Property," see *ibid.*, p. 281.

THE POLITICS OF JOHN ADAMS

At the age of twenty-three John Adams wrote in his diary the following words: "Aim at an exact knowledge of the nature, end and means of government. Compare the different forms of it with each other and each of them with their effects on public and private happiness." This programme he carried out. To the end of his life "no romance was more entertaining" than politics. They were to him the "divine science, the grandest, the noblest, the most useful . . . in the whole circle" of sciences; and his study of them was characterized by breadth and depth as well as zeal. The principles of government, so he wrote his kinsman, Samuel Adams, are to be found by the observation and study of "human nature, society and universal history." He acquainted himself thoroughly with the political theories of the great writers, ancient and modern—the works of Lord Bolingbroke, for example, he read through more than five times although, in his opinion, the author was "a haughty, arrogant, supercilious dogmatist;" but he owed far more to the direct study of "human nature, society and universal history" than to the conclusions of the philosophers. As a rule he quotes to refute; and his work presents in every part unmistakable signs of an original, independent, and profound thinker.

Public events soon gave to these studies a fresh impulse and at the same time a practical turn. Two years after the entry given above, John Adams listened to the plea of James Otis against the Writs of Assistance. It was an event of profound significance to colonial America and indeed to the British empire. "Otis's oration against writs of assistance," wrote John Adams long afterwards, "breathed into this nation the breath of life . . . American Independence was then and there born; the seeds of patriots and heroes were then and there sown . . . Every man of a crowded audience appeared to me to go away, as I did, ready to take up arms against writs of assistance. Then and there was the first scene of the first act of opposition to the arbitrary claims of Great Britain."¹

One result of the plea of Otis was to direct attention to the

¹ *Life and Works*, X. 362.

question of the rights of the colonists. It was a time when the doctrine of natural rights was beginning to work its way into general favor; there was, indeed, considerable risk that it might become in America, as later in France, the basis of popular resistance to governmental oppression. The validity of this doctrine when reasonably interpreted and applied, is well established; but in practical use it is dangerous and greatly demoralizing. Indeed, it can hardly be doubted that if resistance to the oppressive policy of Great Britain had rested solely or mainly on the doctrine of natural rights, it must soon have degenerated into mob violence, and could not have developed into a successful revolution.

At this time John Adams was a young lawyer with an abundance of time for reading and thought. He was a graduate of Harvard, had taught school and studied law at Worcester, had enjoyed intercourse with a number of stimulating men; and, for his years, had read and re-read a phenomenal number of good books. His letters and diary show that he had made great progress in self-acquaintance; that his aims were of the highest; that he revered the truth; and that he criticized himself with unsparing severity. The important historic events of his early manhood were the Seven Years' War and the philosophical movement in Europe; and these had helped to confirm in him the disposition to take broad views and to trace things to their sources.

In the year 1765, with the solid equipment just described, John Adams, at the age of thirty, entered the service of his country. He wrote in August a series of articles, four in number, for the *Boston Gazette*, which were reproduced in the *London Chronicle*, and later were published together under the title, *A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law*. The *Dissertation* began with a statement of the views of the writer upon the relation of the Stamp Act to general history, to the history of the colonies, and to their higher interests, civil, religious, and intellectual; it closed with advice as to the means proper for meeting the emergency created by the adoption of the policy embodied in this act. This production did much to prepare the people for the critical times that were just ahead; it discloses at the outset of his long career of patriotic service, the very heart and mind of the author. Our immediate interest, however, is to learn what it tells of his system of politics.

The *Dissertation* opens with the inquiry, What is the source of oppression? This is found in that "noble principle" of human nature which is also the source of freedom, namely, "the love of power." This principle has always prompted the great of the earth to free themselves from every limitation to their power, "has stim-

ulated the common people to aspire at independency, and to confine the power of the great within the limits of equity and reason." In this struggle the poor people have usually failed, because, owing to their ignorance, "they have seldom been able to frame and support a regular opposition." The great have taken advantage of this, and have labored "in all ages, to wrest from the populace . . . the knowledge of their rights and wrongs, and the power to assert the former or redress the latter. I say *Rights* for such they have . . . antecedent to all earthly government, *Rights* that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws—*Rights* derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."

In these early paragraphs appear certain views that lie at the foundation of the politics of John Adams. The first is that slavery and freedom proceed from one and the same principle in human nature, namely the love of power; later in the *Discourses on Davila*, the more comprehensive phrase, "thirst for distinction" is substituted for "love of power"; but the change does not imply any departure from the original idea. A second view of the utmost importance to the comprehension of the system, is that this love of power is an "aspiring, noble principle, founded in benevolence." From this it follows that the aim of a wise public policy must be not to extirpate "the love of power" in the human heart, but so to direct and regulate its operation that it shall issue in freedom. It is certainly one of the noblest characteristics of John Adams that he felt habitually a profound reverence for human nature, and finds in the primary passions of man the proofs of divine wisdom. A third idea is that the common people have rights which are indefeasible. What these are he does not tell us here. But elsewhere he makes it evident that they include the right to equality with the great in the legal protection of person and property, the right to equal participation in law-making, the right of veto upon unfriendly legislation, and the right to education at the public expense.

The second portion of the *Dissertation* is historical. The canon and feudal law were invented by the great for their own advantage. In the canon law we have "the most refined, sublime, extensive and astonishing constitution of policy that was ever conceived by the mind of man," and the Romish clergy framed it "for the aggrandisement of their own order." The feudal law was formed for the same purposes as the canon law: it held the common people "in a state of servile dependence" and "of total ignorance of every thing divine and human excepting the use of arms and the culture of their lands." Then the supporters of these two systems made a "wicked confederacy," and "one age of darkness succeeded

another, till God in his benign providence, raised up the champions who began and conducted the Reformation." At that time knowledge began to spread "in Europe, but especially in England," and as it spread,

"the people grew more and more sensible of the wrong that was done them by these systems. . . . till at last under the execrable race of the Stuarts, the struggle between the people and the confederacy aforesaid of temporal and spiritual tyranny, became formidable, violent and bloody. It was this great struggle that peopled America. It was not religion alone, as is commonly supposed ; but it was a love of universal liberty, and a hatred, a dread, a horror of the infernal confederacy before described, that projected, conducted and accomplished the settlement of America. It was a resolution formed by a sensible people—I mean the Puritans—almost in despair. . . . After their arrival here, they . . . formed their plan, both of ecclesiastical and civil government, in direct opposition to the canon and feudal systems. . . . Whatever imperfections may be justly ascribed to them, which, however, are as few as any mortals have discovered, their judgment in framing their policy was founded in wise, humane and benevolent principles. It was founded in revelation and in reason too. It was consistent with the principles of the best and greatest and wisest legislators of antiquity. Tyranny in every form, shape and appearance was their disdain and abhorrence. . . . They were very far from being enemies to monarchy ; and they knew as well as any men the just regard and honor that is due to the character of a dispenser of the mysteries of the gospel of grace. But they saw clearly that popular powers must be placed as a guard, a control, a balance, to the powers of the monarch and the priest, in every government. Their greatest concern seems to have been to establish a government of the church more consistent with the Scriptures, and a government of the state more agreeable to the dignity of human nature. . . . They knew that government was a plain, simple, intelligible thing, founded in nature and reason, and quite comprehensible by common sense. . . . They were convinced by their knowledge of human nature, derived from history and their own experience, that nothing could preserve their posterity from the encroachments of the two systems of tyranny . . . but knowledge diffused generally through the whole body of the people. . . . For this purpose they laid very early the foundations of colleges. . . . But the wisdom and benevolence of our fathers rested not here. They made an early provision by law that every town consisting of so many families, should be always furnished with a grammar school. They made it a crime for such a town to be destitute of a grammar schoolmaster for a few months, and subjected it to a heavy penalty. So that the education of all ranks of people was made the care and expense of the public, in a manner that I believe has been unknown to any other people, ancient or modern. . . . The consequences of these establishments we see and feel every day. A native of America who cannot read and write is

as rare an appearance as a Jacobite or a Roman Catholic, that is, as rare as a comet or an earthquake. It has been observed that we are all of us lawyers, divines, politicians and philosophers.”¹

For our purpose it is not the accuracy and justice of the account in which the writer describes the rise of the canon and feudal law, that chiefly concern us ; what we care to note is the conception of the significance as an event in the history of the world, of the planting and peculiar development of the Puritan colonies in America. To their founders he ascribes the loftiest aims ; in their devotion, steadfastness of purpose, unflinching courage, and eminently practical wisdom he sees the noblest spiritual traits ; and in their achievements the highest form and furthest advance of human progress. The mission of the new world has dawned upon him in all its grandeur : “I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scene and design in Providence for the illumination of the ignorant, and the emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth.”²

The Stamp Act proves the existence of “a design to enslave all America.” How shall we baffle this design ? Only by imitating the example of those who founded the colonies ; like them we must “diffuse knowledge generally through the whole body of the people.” For

“liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right, from the frame of their nature, to knowledge, as their great Creator, who does nothing in vain, has given them understandings, and a desire to know ; but besides this they have a right, an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the characters and conduct of their rulers. Rulers are no more than attorneys, agents, and trustees, for the people ; and if the cause, the interest and trust, is insidiously betrayed, or wantonly trifled away, the people have a right to revoke the authority that they themselves have deputed, and to constitute abler and better agents, attorneys and trustees. And the preservation of the means of knowledge among the lowest ranks, is of more importance to the public than all the property of all the rich men in the country. It is even of more consequence to the rich themselves, and to their posterity.”

Without knowledge the spirit of liberty

“would be little better than a brutal rage. Let us tenderly and kindly cherish, therefore, the means of knowledge. Let us dare to read, think, speak, and write Let all become attentive to the grounds and principles of government, ecclesiastical and civil. Let

¹ *Works*, III. 449-456.

² *Works*, III. 452.

us study the law of nature ; search into the spirit of the British constitution ; read the histories of ancient ages ; contemplate the great examples of Greece and Rome ; set before us the conduct of our own British ancestors, who have defended for us the inherent rights of mankind against foreign and domestic tyrants and usurpers, against arbitrary kings and cruel priests Let us read and recollect and impress upon our souls the views and ends of our own more immediate forefathers, in exchanging their native country for a dreary, inhospitable wilderness. Let us examine into the nature of that power, and the cruelty of that oppression, which drove them from their homes Let us recollect it was liberty, the hope of liberty for themselves and us and ours, which conquered all discouragements, dangers, and trials Let the pulpit resound with the doctrines and sentiments of religious liberty Let the bar proclaim, ' the laws, the rights, the generous plan of power ' delivered down from remote antiquity, inform the world of the mighty struggles and numberless sacrifices made by our ancestors in defence of freedom Let them search for the foundations of British laws and government in the frame of human nature, in the constitution of the intellectual world. There let us see that truth, liberty, justice, and benevolence, are its everlasting basis Let the public disputations (in the Colleges) become researches into the grounds and nature and ends of government, and the means of preserving the good and demolishing the evil."¹

This prologue, which reveals the character as well as the political principles of John Adams, furnishes the key to his career. The attitude here taken is that of a statesman who studies public questions in their largest aspects, who asks how they relate themselves to the past, to the future and to those interests of the people which concern character and destiny; and this attitude he maintains to the end.

The first period in the public career of John Adams covers the years from the Stamp Act to the first Continental Congress, 1765 to 1774. In September of the year first named he wrote the *Instructions* of the town of Braintree to its representatives in the General Court. In these he set forth in clear terms that theory of nullification which has played so great a part in American constitutional history. The Stamp Act violated—so the writer held—fundamental constitutional rights, rights well-defined, long enjoyed and essential to the welfare of the people. He declared the Stamp Act unconstitutional because

" we have always understood it to be a grand and fundamental principle of the constitution, that no freeman should be subject to any tax to which he has not given his own consent in person or by proxy. And the maxims of the law, as we have constantly received them, are to the same effect, that no freeman can be separated from his

¹ III. 462-463.

property but by his own act or fault. We take it clearly, therefore, to be inconsistent with the spirit of the common law, and of the essential fundamental principles of the British constitution, that we should be subject to any tax imposed by the British Parliament; because we are not represented in that assembly in any sense, unless it be by a fiction of law, as insensible in theory as it would be injurious in practice, if such a taxation should be grounded on it."

But if these remonstrances should not be heeded: . . .

"We further recommend the most clear and explicit assertion and vindication of our rights and liberties to be entered on the public records, that the world may know, in the present and all future generations, that we have a clear knowledge and a just sense of them, and, with submission to Divine Providence, that we never can be slaves."¹

That these instructions adequately expressed the convictions of his fellow-citizens was soon made evident; forty towns in addition to Braintree accepted them as their own, and Samuel Adams incorporated some of the stronger passages in the instructions which he drew up for Boston.

This work of political education was carried on, not, however, without considerable interruptions, throughout the period of resistance. One of the most important services in this line was a number of articles signed *Novanglus* in reply to a series written by the loyalist, Daniel Leonard, over the signature *Massachusettensis*. Leonard's arguments had made a deep impression; to remove this John Adams, who found on his return from Congress "in the month of November, 1774 . . . the *Massachusetts Gazette* teeming with political speculations, and *Massachusettensis* shining like the moon among the lesser stars . . . instantly resolved to enter the lists." These articles, while of uneven merit in respect to argument, served well the end for which they were written.² Another important function of Mr. Adams during these years was that of legal counsellor to the patriotic party. His advice was sought and followed in the graver controversies with Governor Hutchinson; and it was he who originated the brilliant and wholly successful project to impeach Chief-Justice Oliver.³ His part throughout was that of a law-abiding citizen. He discountenanced the numerous acts of violence directed against the persons and property of the Loyalists; his approval of the destruction of the tea in Boston Harbor rested on political grounds; his defense of Captain Preston and his soldiers exhibited in the clearest light his respect for legal rights and his purpose to do his duty at whatever cost to popularity. Until 1774

¹ III. 466.

² *Works*, IV. 5-177.

³ *Works*, II. 328-332.

he was a lawyer seeking professional success and at the same time serving his countrymen as their unsalaried teacher and adviser in matters pertaining to constitutional rights and the higher politics. In 1774 came a great change. He was chosen a delegate to the first Continental Congress. Henceforth for twenty-seven years, and without a break, he was to give his entire services to his country. Instantly the field widened; the continent took the place of the single colony; he journeyed to Philadelphia as a son of Massachusetts, an inquisitive and sometimes sharply critical observer of the strange peoples and manners that he met there and on the way thither; he returned from Philadelphia a continental American.

The second period extends from the assembling of the first Continental Congress to the treaty in which Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the United States, 1774 to 1783.

The work of John Adams at Philadelphia is too well known to call for rehearsal in this place.¹ He took part in the measures looking to reconciliation, but had little or no faith in their efficacy. He labored strenuously and with success for two ends: the union of the colonies and the separation from Great Britain. In so doing he brought himself into disfavor with Dickinson and other conservatives, but at the same time laid the foundations of that influence which later made him the strongest of the leaders of the Continental Congress. His motive in proposing the appointment of Washington to the command of the army was to promote the union of the colonies. He formed durable friendships with representative men from the different colonies. Through these friendships the way was opened for the propagation of his ideas on the proper structure of government. The Declaration of Independence was in one sense a personal vindication; but his letters, written at this period, speak only of the joy and exultation of the large-souled patriot who is also a seer and prophet:

"When I look back to the year 1761, and recollect the argument concerning writs of assistance in the superior court, which I have hitherto considered as the commencement of this controversy between Great Britain and America, and run through the whole period from that time to this, and recollect the series of political events, the chain of causes and effects, I am surprised at the suddenness as well as greatness of this revolution. . . . It is the will of Heaven that the two countries should be sundered forever. It may be the will of Heaven that America shall suffer calamities still more wasting, and distresses yet more dreadful. If this is to be the case,

¹ In Judge Chamberlain's excellent essay entitled *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution*, we have for the first time what seems to me an adequate estimate of the revolutionary service of John Adams.

it will have this good effect at least. It will inspire us with many virtues which we have not, and correct many errors, follies, and vices which threaten to disturb, dishonor, and destroy us. The furnace of affliction produces refinement in states as well as individuals. And the new Governments we are assuming in every part will require a purification from our vices, and an augmentation of our virtues, or they will be no blessings. The people will have unbounded power, and the people are extremely addicted to corruption and venality, as well as the great. But I must submit all my hopes and fears to an overruling Providence, in which, unfashionable as the faith may be, I firmly believe. . . . The second day of July, 1776, will be the most memorable epocha in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore. You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory."¹

During the middle portion of this period Mr. Adams was chairman of the Board of War and a member of many other important congressional committees. Although possessing in but a moderate degree the talents for organization and administration which distinguished his later rival, Alexander Hamilton, he brought to these tasks certain qualities of mind and character which in a situation of appalling difficulty were of the highest value: he never doubted; he never quailed; he always had a plan; and his own faith and courage he communicated to others. In a very high degree he was the source of the moral energy without which the Revolution must have failed. These qualities he carried abroad and to them he owed his remarkable diplomatic success in Holland. At the Court of France it soon appeared that he could not work with Franklin:—so unlike and antipathetic were they by nature; nor could he reach an understanding with Vergennes, so that his record there was one of well-meant, unsparing but unsuccessful efforts. This failure, however, was nobly redeemed by the part he took in the negotiations for peace. To him in a special sense, his country owed her rights in the fisheries and a considerable portion of her territory. One graphic pen-picture of himself as a maker of this treaty is included in his diary. When discussing the American demands in regard to the fisheries an English negotiator proposed to substitute the word

¹ *Familiar Letters*, pp. 193, 194.

"liberty" for "right." "Upon this I rose up and said. 'Gentlemen, is there or can there be a clearer right? . . . When God Almighty made the banks of Newfoundland at three hundred leagues distance from the people of America, and at six hundred leagues distance from those of France and England, did he not give as good a right to the former as to the latter? If Heaven in the creation gave a right it is ours at least as much as yours. If occupation, use, and possession give a right, we have it as clearly as you. If war, and blood, and treasure give a right, ours is as good as yours.'"¹

It is safe to say that the United States have never had a representative at a foreign court who better understood American rights or defended them more manfully. His country "was destined," so he believed, "to be the greatest power on earth;" and his claims for her were based on that belief. This was one of the reasons—perhaps the chief one—for his dislike of Vergennes: "I told him [Mr. Hartley, one of the British negotiators], the Comte de Vergennes and I were pursuing different objects; he was endeavoring to make my countrymen meek and humble, and I was laboring to make them proud; I avowed it was my object to make them hold up their heads and look down upon any nation that refused to do them justice."² In a letter to the President of Congress, dated Paris, September 5, 1783, he writes of national pride as follows:

"We may call this national vanity or national pride, but it is the main principle of the national sense of its own dignity, and a passion in human nature, without which nations cannot preserve the character of man. Let the people lose this sentiment, as in Poland, and a partition of their country will soon take place. Our country has but lately been a dependent one, and our people, although enlightened and virtuous, have had their minds and hearts habitually filled with all the passions of a dependent and subordinate people; that is to say, with fear, with diffidence, and distrust of themselves, with admiration of foreigners, &c. Now, I say, that it is one of the most necessary and one of the most difficult branches of the policy of congress to eradicate from the American mind every remaining fibre of this fear and self-diffidence on one hand, and of this excessive admiration of foreigners on the other."³

Bitter indeed were his reflections upon that (fortunately disregarded) act of Congress which virtually transferred the negotiation from its own ministers to a foreign court. "Congress surrendered their own sovereignty into the hands of a French minister. Blush! Blush! ye guilty records! blush and perish! It is a glory to have broken such infamous orders."⁴

¹ *Works*, III. 333.

² *Works*, III. 365.

³ *Works*, VIII. 144.

⁴ *Works*, III. 359.

It fairly summarizes the foreign policy of John Adams to say that in the course of his diplomatic career we find him the earnest advocate of every principle of foreign policy recommended more than a decade afterwards in Washington's Farewell Address.

But even more important to the welfare of the United States than his services in Congress and abroad, great as they undoubtedly were, was the part he took in the reconstruction of government in the several colonies. The opportunity made a deep impression upon Adams. To Patrick Henry he wrote: "You and I, my dear friend, have been sent into life at a time when the greatest law-givers of antiquity would have wished to live. . . . When, before the present epocha, had three millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the happiest and wisest government that human wisdom can contrive?"¹ This work began a few months before the Declaration of Independence, and in determining its character John Adams had far more influence than any other one man. Moreover, in directing the reorganization of government in the states, he was helping to lay the foundations of a national government for the United States.²

¹ *Works*, IV. 200.

² The materials for a study of the political system of John Adams are: 1. A letter to Richard Henry Lee, dated Philadelphia, November 15, 1775 (*Works*, IV. 185-187). 2. A letter to George Wythe, written in January, 1776, which was published under the title, *Thoughts on Government* (*ibid.*, 193-200). 3. A letter to John Penn in response to a request from the colonial legislature of North Carolina for the views of Mr. Adams on the "nature of the government it would be proper to form in case of the final dissolution of the authority of the Crown." This letter reproduces the substance of the *Thoughts on Government*, but in some places gives a fuller statement of the views of the writer (*ibid.*, 203-209). 4. *Report of the Constitution or Form of Government for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts*. This was written in September 1779, and contains the ideas of Mr. Adams on the subject of government in their most complete and systematic form. Especially valuable is that portion of the report which contains the Declaration of Rights. Of the thirty articles, the third only, which provides for public worship, was not included in the original draft by Mr. Adams. Most of the changes made later by the Committee and the Convention affect the expression rather than the substance of the author's views. He had also the leading part in drafting the second part of the Constitution, or the *Frame of Government* (*ibid.*, 213-267). In order to appreciate the importance of Mr. Adams's *Model of Government* for Massachusetts and of the earlier sketches in the *Thoughts on Government*, it is necessary to remember that at the time they were prepared each of the American commonwealths was regarded as a sovereign state and that the constitution proposed was designed for such a state (*ibid.*, 217). 5. *A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*, in three volumes. The first volume was published in 1787, the second and third in the following year (*ibid.*, 269-588; V., VI. 1-220). 6. *Discourses on Davila*, published in 1790 (*ibid.*, 221-399). The *Defence* and the *Discourses* have the same object, namely, to establish by an appeal to history the soundness of the author's views on government as set forth in the *Thoughts* and *Model*.

Of great value too as expositions of the system are four letters of John Adams and Samuel Adams on government (*ibid.*, 405-426); three letters to Roger Sherman (*ibid.*, 427-442); a series of thirty-two letters to John Taylor (*ibid.*, 443-521), and a Review

John Adams held that in a properly constructed government there should be three branches, the legislative, executive and judicial. The legislative branch should consist, first, of an assembly to represent the people or the democratic element; second, of a senate to represent the aristocratic element; and lastly, of an executive to represent the state in its entirety; to act as umpire in cases of dispute between the aristocratic and democratic branches of the legislature; and to be the protector of each in case of an attempt at encroachment by the other. Each division of the legislature should possess an absolute veto. The judges should be appointed by the executive; should hold their offices during good behavior; and should not be subject to intimidation in the matter of salary. It is obvious that in its general framework this structure corresponds quite closely with that of England. Notable differences, however, are the more complete and uniform representation of the people, and the substitution of the elective for the hereditary principle in constituting the senate and executive. In respect to representation and the exclusion of the hereditary principle the system reproduces that of the colonies; in respect to the dependence of the senate and executive upon the people, the system conforms to that of Massachusetts (under her first charter), Connecticut and Rhode Island. The right of the executive to an absolute veto was copied from the theory of the English Constitution and from the actual practice in most of the colonies; in England it had not been exercised for nearly a century; but in all the colonies, except Rhode Island and Connecticut, both the royal and proprietary governors had used it so freely and in many cases so improperly, that it had become exceedingly obnoxious. It will be noted that the structural principle underneath this system is the independence of the several parts.

Turning to the views of Adams in regard to public policy we find that the end of government is the "happiness of the people." But the happiness of the people consists "in virtue," hence the effort of the statesman should be to secure the happiness of the people by the development of the "best character." The influence of a public man or measure upon the character of the people is to him a matter of prime importance. In furtherance of this end, namely, the development of the best character, public policy should foster religion, morality, and learning.¹

of a Proposition for Amending the Constitution, submitted by Mr. Hillhouse to the Senate of the United States in 1808 (*ibid.*, 525-550).

¹Article second of the Declaration of Rights which forms the first division of the Constitution of Massachusetts, affirms it to be "the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the SUPREME BEING" (*Works*, IV, 221). He

John Adams made religion the basis of his system of politics. He believed that the foundations of every political system are to be looked for in certain enduring convictions in respect to God, Nature and Man. Beneath systems of tyranny lie the conceptions of deity as cruel and despotic, of the natural world as ill regulated and unfriendly, of man as weak and unworthy; beneath systems of freedom lie the opposed convictions, that God is just and merciful, that the laws which govern the universe have their source in wisdom and goodness, and that in the nature of man there is a divine element which invests every human being with dignity, with rights and duties and with an infinite capacity for progress towards the ideally perfect.

There is no recorded word of John Adams which expresses a doubt of the existence of God, or of His justice, goodness, and active agency in the government of the world; on the contrary his diary, letters, and public utterances as well as his conduct prove that by nature and conviction he was deeply religious, and that he regarded true religion as the indispensable basis of human welfare private and public. He could not, however, accept the Calvinistic views which in his day still ruled New England theology. They contradicted too sharply his sense of the divine justice and goodness; it was for this reason that he decided soon after graduation from college to abandon the plan of entering the ministry and to prepare himself instead for the profession of the law. But in rejecting certain features of Calvinism he did not reject religion; on the contrary the rejection was for him a step towards a more natural and perfect development of the religious life. The best statesman in his view was he who most clearly discerned and most faithfully copied the divine plan of government.

"Statesmen . . . may plan and speculate for liberty," so he wrote at the age of eighty-five, "but it is religion and morality alone, which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand." His view of the Christian religion as a factor in political education appears in one of the latest entries in his diary: "One great advantage of the Christian religion is, that it brings the great principle of the law of nature and nations—Love your neighbor as yourself,

wished to make the Christian religion a qualification for the office of governor, senator, and representative of Massachusetts. In his inaugural address as President he declares it his "fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for public service." (*Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I. 232.) Although to the end of his days a "meeting-going animal," he was no bigot in matters of religion. He wished the Continental Congress to have nothing to do with religion except to "say their own prayers" and appoint each year a public Fast and Thanksgiving. In both of the constitutional conventions of which he was a member, he was ready to go further than his associates in establishing religious freedom.

and do to others as you would that others should do to you—to the knowledge, belief, and veneration of the whole people. . . . No other institution for education, no kind of political discipline, could diffuse this kind of necessary information, so universally. . . . The duties and rights of the man and the citizen are thus taught from early infancy to every creature.”¹

In a letter to his wife dated November 5, 1775, he discourses on the relations of religion to patriotism as follows: “A true patriot must be a religious man. I have been led to think . . . that he who neglects his duty to his Maker may well be expected to be deficient and insincere in his duties towards the public. Even suppose him to possess a large share of what is called honor and public spirit, yet do not these men, by their bad example, by a loose immoral conduct, corrupt the minds of youth and vitiate the morals of the age and thus injure the public more than they can compensate by intrepidity, generosity and honor?”² And yet no religious man of his day was more tolerant than he.

Other essential features of a sound public policy are a generous provision for the education of the people, liberality towards institutions of higher learning and fair compensation for public service. Adams held that the people could not afford to accept uncompensated service; to do so was inconsistent with their self-respect, and in the end would prove costly and demoralizing.

The third period extends from the treaty of peace to the election of Mr. Adams as President, 1783 to 1796. He remained abroad five years after signing the treaty. One was spent in diplomatic service in Holland, the others as minister plenipotentiary at the court of St. James. In the drama of history, it was a great moment when John Adams the former arch-rebel first stood in the presence of George III., as the representative of a free people, once the loyal subjects of His Britannic Majesty; and who could know and feel its significance so well as he to whom this august scene was the consummation of all that he had hoped and toiled for? His own account shows how profoundly his whole nature was stirred; and nobly did he bear himself; when he declared “I have no attachment save to my own country,” even the King was moved, and uttered the true-hearted words: “No honest man will have any other.” But this proved to be only a transient gleam of good sense and magnanimity on the part of the monarch; the perverseness through which he had alienated and lost the colonies, led him and his ministers to refuse the rational and mutually beneficial propositions of Mr. Adams in regard to commerce. The minister and his

¹ *Works*, III. 423.

² *Familiar Letters*, 122.

family were made to feel both at court and in society, and in a very personal way, the dislike and disesteem in which their country was held. Even Burke and Camden, whom Americans justly revered, seemed to the sufferer participants in the ignoble persecution. But what had these unhappy experiences to do with the politics of John Adams? It is probable that they account in some measure for that feeling of settled distrust towards English policy, that pessimism in respect to the future of England, and that prompt rejection of every measure of foreign policy which would in any degree make the United States dependent upon England that marked his course henceforth,—for, in short, that policy towards England which was a chief cause of difference between himself and the Federalist party.

Baffled in his efforts at the English court and moved by ill news from America where the democracy was seeking, especially in Massachusetts, to overthrow the balanced system of government in the establishment of which he had taken so distinguished a part, John Adams seized the occasion offered by the belated publication of M. Turgot's criticisms of the American governments, to write a defence of the principles on which they were founded. He began this work in October of 1786, and finished it in late December of 1787. The first volume, entitled *A Defence of the Constitutions of the Governments of the United States of America*, reached Philadelphia in time to influence the deliberations of the framers of the Constitution of 1787. The work is a defence on philosophical and historical grounds of the balanced system of government already described. In a special sense it is a defence of the aristocratic and executive elements of government; for these were then under attack. The general result of an extended survey of the history of governments, ancient, medieval and modern, and of theories of government set forth by writers on politics, may be stated as follows: Every simple government, whether democratic, aristocratic or monarchical, is of necessity despotic: among such, as reason would teach us to expect, history clearly proves that the democratic is the worst. What actually came to pass a few years later in that phase of the French Revolution named the Reign of Terror, the writer foretold as the natural result of the attempt to establish a purely democratic government. Moreover, although the plan of a simple democracy has been tried in a number of instances, it has never yet succeeded; nor in the nature of the case, can it ever do so. Despotism is equally inevitable under a simple aristocracy or monarchy. Nor can we find a single instance of good and stable government under systems which unite any two of the three principles while excluding the third; for in such equilibrium is impossible;

a struggle for ascendancy is sure to follow; and this must issue after the overthrow of the weaker principle in the despotism of the stronger. A feature of the *Defence* which aroused the distrust of radical democrats at home was the emphasis laid upon the value of the aristocratic element in the state. To seek to do away with aristocracy is idle; for it is a creation of nature. Whatever a man possesses that gives him an advantage over others makes of him an aristocrat. There is nowhere a society without its aristocratic section. To this belong those who have beauty, the well-born, the rich, the talented, the virtuous. Boston has her nobles—so he wrote Samuel Adams—as well as Madrid. “Hereditary powers and peculiar privileges enter in no degree necessarily into the definition of Aristocracy;” and the Americans have wisely discarded them. The views of John Adams upon aristocracy have been so widely misapprehended that they should be stated in his own words. In 1814, in a series of letters to John Taylor, he gave what is perhaps the most comprehensive of the many definitions that may be traced to his pen:

“By natural aristocracy, in general, may be understood those superiorities of influence in society which grow out of the constitution of human nature. By artificial aristocracy, those inequalities of weight and superiorities of influence which are created and established by civil laws. Terms must be defined before we can reason. By aristocracy, I understand all those men who can command, influence, or procure more than an average of votes; by an aristocrat, every man who can and will influence one man to vote besides himself. Few men will deny that there is a natural aristocracy of virtues and talents in every nation and in every party, in every city and village. Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man.”¹

“This natural aristocracy among mankind, has been dilated on, because it is a fact essential to be considered in the institution of a government. It forms a body of men which contains the greatest collection of virtues and abilities in a free government, is the brightest ornament and glory of the nation, and may always be made the greatest blessing of society, if it be judiciously managed in the constitution. But if this be not done, it is always the most dangerous, nay, it may be added, it never fails to be the destruction of the commonwealth . . . There is but one expedient yet discovered, to avail society of all the benefits from this body of men, which they are capable of affording, and at the same time, to prevent them from undermining or invading the public liberty; and that is, to throw them all, or at least the most remarkable of them, into one assembly together, in the legislature; to keep all the executive power entirely out of their hands as a body; to erect a first magistrate over them, invested with the whole executive authority; to make them

¹ *Works*, VI. 451.

dependent on that same executive magistrate for all public executive employments ; to give that first magistrate a negative on the legislature."¹

Strongly too did he emphasize the necessity for an executive deriving his authority directly from the people, completely independent of the legislature, capable of representing "the majesty, persons, wills and power of the people in the administration of government and dispensing of laws," and powerful enough to maintain "the balance between the Senate and House, or in other words between the aristocratical and democratical interests."

As happened when the state governments were formed, so now at the framing of the national Constitution the views of John Adams were accepted only in part. To the Senate was given a participation in executive functions which Mr. Adams predicted would transform the President of the United States into a slave of party, and at the same time would corrupt the Senate. Legislative participation in the appointing power he thought as baneful to government as rust to iron, as arsenic to the human body. He also thought it a great defect of the Constitution that it did not give to the President the absolute veto.

The election of John Adams to the vice-presidency in 1788, and re-election four years later, prove that despite the unpopular doctrines of the *Defence*, he was still, in the esteem of the people, second only to Washington. During these comparatively tranquil years he gave cordial support to Washington and the Federalist party. In 1790 while the French Revolution was still under the control of the moderates, he took his pen in hand and in a series of *Discourses on Davila* pointed out the grave not to say ruinous errors committed by the leaders of that fateful movement. He did more : in order to make the reasonableness of his condemnation evident, he formulated more fully than in his earlier writings the theory of social man on which his system of politics rested :

"Men, in their primitive conditions, however savage, were undoubtedly gregarious ; and they continue to be social, not only in every stage of civilization, but in every possible situation in which they can be placed. As nature intended them for society, she has furnished them with passions, appetites, and propensities, as well as a variety of faculties, calculated both for their individual enjoyment, and to render them useful to each other in their social connections. There is none among them more essential or remarkable, than the passion for distinction. A desire to be observed, considered, esteemed, praised, beloved, and admired by his fellows, is one of the earliest, as well as keenest dispositions discovered in the heart of man . . . The desire of the esteem of others is as real a want of

¹ *Works*, IV. 397, 398.

nature as hunger ; and the neglect and contempt of the world as severe a pain as the gout or stone."

"The poor man's conscience is clear ; yet he is ashamed. His character is irreproachable ; yet he is neglected and despised. He feels himself out of the sight of others, groping in the dark. Mankind take no notice of him. He rambles and wanders unheeded. In the midst of a crowd, at church, in the market, at a play, at an execution, or coronation, he is in as much obscurity as he would be in a garret or a cellar. He is not disapproved, censured or reproached ; he is only not seen. . . . If you follow these persons, however, into their scenes of life, you will find that there is a kind of figure which the meanest of them all endeavors to make ; a kind of little grandeur and respect, which the most insignificant study and labor to procure in the small circle of their acquaintances. Not only the poorest mechanic, but the man who lives upon common charity, nay, the common beggars in the streets ; and not only those who may be all innocent, but even those who have abandoned themselves to common infamy, as pirates, highwaymen and common thieves, court a set of admirers, and plume themselves upon that superiority which they have, or fancy they have, over some others. There must be one, indeed, who is the last and lowest of the human species. But there is no risk in asserting, that there is no one who believes and will acknowledge himself to be the man. To be wholly overlooked, and to know it, are intolerable. When a wretch could no longer attract the notice of a man, woman or child, he must be respectable in the eyes of his dog. 'Who will love me then?' was the pathetic reply of one, who starved himself to feed his mastiff, to a charitable passenger, who advised him to kill or sell the animal. In this 'who will love me then?' there is a key to the human heart ; to the history of human life and manners, and to the rise and fall of empires.

"This passion, while it is simply a desire to excel another, by fair industry in the search of truth and the practice of virtue, is properly called Emulation. When it aims at power, as a means of distinction, it is Ambition. When it is in a situation to suggest the sentiments of fear and apprehension, that another, who is now inferior, will become superior, it is denominated Jealousy. When it is in a state of mortification, at the superiority of another, and desires to bring him down to our level, or to depress him below us, it is properly called Envy. When it deceives a man into a belief of false professions of esteem or admiration, or into a false opinion of his importance in the judgment of the world, it is Vanity. These observations alone would be sufficient to show, that this propensity, in all its branches, is a principal source of the virtues and vices, the happiness and misery of human life ; and that the history of mankind is little more than a simple narration of its operation and effects."¹

¹*Works*, VI. 232-239.

From such principles it followed that those Frenchmen who were striving to suppress the inequalities which arise from this universal "thirst for distinction" were at war with nature. Indeed, Adams held that the only equality practicable and desirable is equality before the laws. "Too many Frenchmen," so he wrote Dr. Price, "after the example of too many Americans, pant after equality of persons and property. The impracticability of this God Almighty has decreed."¹ Such views and sentiments however wise ran counter to the strong tides of American political passion. The result to himself of giving them utterance he afterwards described in a letter to Jefferson: "In truth my *Defence of the Constitutions* and *Discourses on Davila* were the causes of that immense unpopularity which fell like the tower of Siloam upon me. Your steady defence of democratic principles, and your invariable favorable opinion of the French Revolution, laid the foundation of your unbounded popularity."² And yet despite this immense unpopularity with the democratic masses, despite the well-grounded fear of many Federalist leaders that this man of strong will and independent views might prove unmanageable, and despite the treacherous plan to give to Pinckney the place which the voters allotted to him, John Adams was chosen as the successor of Washington.

With this event opened the last chapter of his public career. Throughout the previous period, fidelity to his country and to his political system had made him the advocate of a policy that coincided with that of the Federalists; but now the tie between him and the leaders of the Federalist party, particularly those whose homes were in the North, was about to be broken. The forces that did this were two: first a difference of view in respect to foreign policy; and second, a disagreement as to the proper functions and rights of the executive. We need not rehearse here the story of the struggle between the President and his cabinet, the latter acting under the direction of Hamilton and in collusion with leading Federalist senators: it will suffice to point out that when the secretaries undertook to thwart the President in his purpose to renew negotiations with France, and also when they sought by a clandestine appeal to Washington to secure the appointment of Hamilton to the virtual command of the army, they arrogated to themselves rights which the Constitution had conferred upon their official chief. Pickering, Wolcott, and McHenry were not prompted by motives of personal ambition. They were doing the will of a division of the Federal party whose leader was Hamilton; their plan was to transfer to him the high functions which belong to the President. No one ques-

¹ *Works*, IX. 564.

² *Works*, X. 54.

tions now that John Adams was in the right in renewing the negotiations with France ; in the long series of services that he rendered his country, this was certainly one of the most heroic and beneficent. Nor does any one question now his view of the functions of President and cabinet. But in bestowing peace on his country and in maintaining the rights of her chief magistrate he alienated an important section of the Federal party.

The party revolution of 1800 brought the public career of John Adams to a close, but not, however, until he had named John Marshall as chief justice, a nomination second in importance in its bearing on the welfare of the Union only to that which was made by him a quarter of a century earlier, when he proposed the name of George Washington as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army.

With the possible exception of Daniel Webster no other American statesman of the highest rank has retired so hated and unfriended as did John Adams. The followers of Jefferson regarded him as a monarchist and a persecutor of democrats ; the followers of Hamilton as a traitor to the cause of Federalism. But the truth is that his course from the beginning was singularly consistent. His simple creed was this : in order that a state may prosper it must have in its government a democratic element, an aristocratic element and an executive ; each of these must be strong enough to maintain its rights ; but each must be checked in its attempts to encroach upon the others. In the first and second periods he devoted himself to the championship of the endangered American democracy and to the reconstruction of the colonial governments on the lines given above ; in the third period he devoted himself to the championship of the aristocratic interest against the encroaching disposition of the democracy, and to the further exposition and defence of his system ; in the fourth period he devoted himself to the championship of the executive against the encroachments of the aristocratic party ; and he was surely in the right. We name only half the truth in claiming for America the mission to produce a finer type of democracy ; a strong and healthful democracy without a strong and healthful aristocracy is impossible ; the two are essential parts of one organic whole. A higher type of aristocracy,—an aristocracy open to every aspiring soul, without legal privilege, based on merit, assigning its highest honor to highest service, welcoming the lowly-born Abraham Lincoln as heartily as the patrician-born George Washington,—to produce such an aristocracy is the only way to produce a healthful, happy, useful democracy ; and to help to establish this type of aristocracy throughout the world is the highest service which America can render to mankind, but this—just this, was what John Adams wished and worked for.

It is narrated that five days before that memorable fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence on which both he and Jefferson were to die, John Adams gave as a toast to be presented at the celebration to be held by his fellow-townsmen, the words INDEPENDENCE FOREVER. "In this brief sentiment," says his biographer, "Mr. Adams infused the essence of his whole character, and of his life-long labors for his country." But independence, however characteristic of the spirit and method, does not seem to me an adequate description of the "essence" of his labors. It is true that he maintained always an unusual degree of personal independence, and that he strove with all his might for "independent independence" in his country's behalf—but only as the necessary means to a certain end ; and this end was the attainment of the "best character." The key to the politics of John Adams is the right and duty incumbent upon each citizen, each class, the people as a whole and mankind, of complete self-realization. To protect and assist the process by which this is accomplished, determines for him the form and functions of government and the aim of public policy. For the divine right to rule, whether claimed by king, parliament or party, he substituted the divine indefeasible right of the people to grow.

ANSON D. MORSE.

THE FIRST REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

THE convention which met in Pittsburg on the 22d of February, 1856, for the purpose of organizing a national Republican party, was called together by the chairmen of the Republican state committees of Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Vermont and Wisconsin. It was not a convention of delegates selected by constituent assemblies of the people, but a mass convention of men who favored the formation of a great national anti-slavery party and who volunteered their services in the undertaking. It was in session two days, and its purpose was fully accomplished, but the report of its proceedings in the newspapers of the time was meagre and inadequate. They were published in pamphlet soon after the convention, but they covered only a few pages, being a mere skeleton of what happened and even less satisfactory than the newspaper reports, while they gave the reader no conception of the spirit and character of the gathering. No roll of the members was preserved, while the several histories of political parties and conventions which have since appeared contain little more than a mere reference to the subject. Since the writer is one of the very few survivors of the convention, and was officially and somewhat actively connected with its proceedings, and since there is always a natural curiosity to know something of the beginnings of a great historic movement, perhaps a brief paper on the subject may prove timely and not entirely without value as a contribution to the literature of politics.

The creation of the proposed new party was a vexed problem. The Whig party had received its death-blow in the presidential campaign of 1852, but it still had a lingering and fragmentary existence. In Michigan its members had united with the Free Soilers and bolting Democrats in state convention as early as July 6, 1854, in forming a Republican party and giving it that name, and this action was followed soon after by like movements in Wisconsin and Vermont. In New York and Massachusetts the Whigs refused to disband, and thus prevented the desired action in these states during the years 1854 and 1855. In Indiana a combination was formed consisting of conservative Whigs, anti-Nebraska Democrats, Know-nothings and Free Soilers. It called itself "the People's Party," and for three years in succession, beginning in 1854, it disowned the name

Republican and subordinated every question of principle to its desire for political success. The situation was most humiliating, but with the nomination of Frémont, Indiana finally started upon its journey out of the wilderness. The formation of a new party in Illinois in 1854 was attempted, but was defeated by the Whigs, who persuaded Abraham Lincoln to avoid any connection with such a movement. The political elements in that state were similar to those in Indiana. In Ohio the new party was launched in 1854 on the basis of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and opposition to the extension of slavery, and Mr. Chase was chosen senator in 1855. Like action was taken in Iowa. In Maine, as in Pennsylvania, a Republican party was not formed till 1856. The Whigs of the northern states generally, and a large proportion of the anti-Nebraska Democrats, finally found their way into the Republican camp through the lodges of Know-nothingism, which served as a convenient escape from their old political bosses. This secret political movement still further complicated the situation. Its action had a two-fold effect. On the one hand, it did good service in the breaking up of the old parties which had so long stood as the bulwarks of slavery; but on the other, its crusade against the Pope and the foreigner tended to balk the rising popular indignation caused by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and thus to divide the people upon side issues instead of uniting them as one man on the single question of slavery. In 1855, Know-nothingism elected the governors of nine northern states and forty-three members of the national House of Representatives. It acted in the dark, and thus fearfully aggravated the political confusion and bewilderment of the times.

A very formidable element had to be reckoned with in the old Free Soil party, which rejoiced in the omens of an anti-slavery revival, but demanded the recognition of its principles in the new organization. This party had given over 291,000 votes in 1848, but four years later it gave only a little over 156,000. This falling off was chiefly caused by the Barnburners of New York and their sympathizers, who had rallied under the Free Soil banner in 1848 for the purpose of punishing their party for throwing Van Buren overboard in 1844, and who now returned to the party fold. The Free Soilers of 1852 however were stronger without this trading element than with it. They stood upon a magnificent platform, and they had the courage of their convictions; and they so commanded the respect of all parties that in 1853, before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise had been attempted, concerted measures had been extensively set on foot for the formation of a national anti-

slavery party consisting of Free Soilers, disbanded Whigs and dissatisfied Democrats. It is morally if not logically certain that such a party would have been organized, and would finally have triumphed if the repeal of the Missouri Compromise had never been proposed. The Free Soilers, however, were not partisans, and they were perfectly willing to disband their organization and lose themselves in a larger movement committed to the essential articles of their political faith. We ought to add, perhaps, that there was still another element which demanded attention in all the states. This was the temperance reform as expounded and enforced in Maine. This movement was then in its first stages, and its progress was amazing. Its champions were on fire with zeal, and their devotion to their cause was a passion. They disputed the proposition that slavery was the paramount question in our politics. Their demand was for the search, seizure, confiscation and destruction of liquors kept for illegal sale. The rum-seller was to be dealt with as a criminal, and the whole fabric of intemperance overthrown by the fiat of legislative prohibition. Such was the political situation in 1856. While the disruption of the old parties seemed easy and imminent, it was equally clear that the organization of their fragments into a new party on a true basis was a totally different problem.

The convention assembled at eleven o'clock in La Fayette Hall, a building which disappeared years ago to make room for a larger structure. It was called to order by Hon. Lawrence Brainerd, of Vermont, who read the call upon which it had convened and asked John A. King, of New York, a son of Rufus King, to act as temporary chairman. After brief and appropriate remarks, Mr. King called on the Rev. Owen Lovejoy, who was present as a representative from Illinois, to open the proceedings with prayer. The name of Lovejoy was an inspiration, for it recalled the murder of his brother by a mob at Alton in 1837, for merely exercising his constitutional right of free speech in a free state in talking about slavery. The heart of the people was manifestly and fervently with him, and there was a suppressed murmur of applause when he asked God to enlighten the mind of the President of the United States, and turn him from his evil ways, and if this was not possible, to take him away, so that an honest and God-fearing man might fill his place. A committee on permanent organization was then appointed, and while it was engaged in its work in an adjoining room the people seemed to be hungry for speeches. When Horace Greeley, with his earnest, kindly face and long white coat, was seen in the audience, he was enthusiastically called for. On taking the platform, he was received with prolonged cheers. He did not speak

at length, but said he had been in Washington several weeks, and that our friends there counselled extreme caution in our movements. He referred to the fact that the powers of the Federal government were in the hands of our enemies, mentioning particularly Jefferson Davis, the Secretary of War, from whom we could count upon no favors. The burden of his speech was the necessity for great caution and moderation on our part. This caused some surprise in the audience, as Mr. Greeley had not been generally regarded as a special exemplar of the virtues he commended; and he afterwards explained himself in the *Tribune* by saying that he had reference to large numbers of good men who had joined the Know-nothing or American party who were at heart entirely with us, and he did not wish to antagonize them in any way in the proceedings of the convention. At the close of Mr. Greeley's remarks, Mr. Giddings was tumultuously called for, and responded by saying that Washington was the last place in the world to look for council or redress, and illustrated his meaning by relating an anecdote of two pious brothers named Joseph and John who in early times had begun a settlement in the West. Joseph prayed, "O Lord! we have begun a good work; we pray Thee to carry it on thus," giving specific directions. But John prayed, "O Lord! we have begun a good work; carry it on as You think best, and don't mind what Joe says." Mr. Giddings then introduced the Rev. Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, "Not Joe, but John." Mr. Lovejoy's speech was characteristic. It was full of fire, denouncing the administration of Franklin Pierce and the interference of border-ruffians from Missouri with the affairs of Kansas. He hoped that the proceedings in that state would arouse such a storm of indignation as would show itself in Kansas and make every man a martyr rather than submit to the infamous laws of the Lecompton legislature. "Who would not lose his life in such a cause? In defense of Kansas I will offer myself as a captain, and if not wanted in that capacity, I will shoulder a gun and go as a private. If I use my Sharp's rifle, I will shoot in God's name. I am for war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt, if it must be so." Preston King, of New York, was called on for a speech, but excused himself, when Col. Gibson, of Ohio, being loudly called for, addressed the convention on the Know-nothing movement. I think he was then without a rival in the West as a stump speaker. There was an irresistible fascination in his oratory which recalled that of Prentiss of Mississippi in his palmy days. No audience could ever grow tired of listening to him.

Siméon Draper of New York, from the committee on organization, now reported the following permanent officers:

President, Francis P. Blair, of Maryland ; vice-presidents, Horatio G. Russ, New Hampshire ; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont ; George Bliss, Massachusetts ; James M. Bunce, Connecticut ; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island ; E. D. Morgan, New York ; W. P. Sherman, New Jersey ; Joseph Farley, Virginia ; Gen. Joseph Markle, Pennsylvania ; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky ; W. Penn Clarke, Iowa ; R. P. Spalding, Ohio ; George W. Julian, Indiana ; John H. McMillan, Illinois ; Gov. Kinsley S. Bingham, Michigan ; David Jones, Wisconsin ; T. P. Newton, Minnesota ; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia ; secretaries, Russell Errett, Pennsylvania ; D. R. Tilden, Ohio ; Isaac Dayton, New York ; John C. Vaughn, Illinois ; J. W. Stone, Massachusetts.

Mr. Blair was escorted to the chair by Preston King of New York and Jacob Brinkerhoff of Ohio, and was greeted with unbounded enthusiasm. He was in feeble health, and probably the oldest man in the convention. He was a journalist of distinction and a politician of national reputation. He was a soldier in our last war with England and was everywhere known as the trusted friend of Gen. Jackson. He had separated from his party in 1848, and given his vote for Van Buren and Adams, and he appeared in this convention as one of the representatives of the South, which had delegates from Texas, Kentucky, Missouri, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina and Tennessee. Upon taking the chair, Mr. Blair remarked that this was the first speech he had ever been called on to make, and that he could not refrain from expressing how much he felt honored by the action of the convention in making him its president. He considered it, however, more as a compliment to the men with whom he had been associated and whom he represented than to any personal merit. He submitted a paper which he commended to the consideration of the convention as the platform of his Southern friends. It was not acted on. It was remarkably well written and evidently prepared with great care ; but he strangely misconceived the spirit and purpose of the convention. His anti-slavery ideal was the Compromise of 1850, which had abandoned the Wilmot Proviso and paved the way for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise ; and he now demanded the restoration of that Compromise as the sole panacea for our troubles. The convention was not beating a retreat to the finality platforms of 1852, but marching in the opposite direction. At the conclusion of Mr. Blair's remarks a recess was taken.

At the afternoon session Abijah Mann, of New York, offered a resolution which was adopted, that a committee of one from each state be appointed to draw up an address and resolutions for the

consideration of the convention. The following committee was selected : Abijah Mann, of New York ; George M. Weston, Maine ; F. C. Johnson, New Hampshire ; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont ; E. R. Hoar, Massachusetts ; ex-Gov. Chauncey F. Cleveland, Connecticut ; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island ; F. Devereaux, New Jersey ; John Allison, Pennsylvania ; W. H. Dennison, Delaware ; Francis P. Blair, Maryland ; James S. Farley, Virginia ; James Redpath, Missouri ; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky ; D. H. Spratt, California ; C. G. Hawthorne, Iowa ; James Dennison, Ohio ; Oliver P. Morton, Indiana ; John C. Vaughn, Illinois ; Jacob M. Howard, Michigan ; Israel Love, Wisconsin ; S. N. Wood, Kansas ; T. M. Houston, Minnesota ; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia.

The appointment of a committee on national organization was the next business in order, and was discussed at some length. It was finally decided that this committee should consist of one member from each state, and it was constituted as follows : Abner Hallowell, Maine ; J. C. Beman, New Hampshire ; Charles G. Davis, Massachusetts ; Mark Howell, Connecticut ; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island ; William A. Sackett, New York ; C. M. K. Pollison, New Jersey ; William H. Dennison, Delaware ; William B. Thomas, Pennsylvania ; F. Kemper, Missouri ; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky ; A. J. Stevens, Iowa ; Charles Reemelin, Ohio ; George W. Julian, Indiana ; Owen Lovejoy, Illinois ; Zachariah Chandler, Michigan ; Charles Durkee, Wisconsin.

At this point, the presiding officer read a despatch from Philadelphia which he had just received, relative to the proceedings of the National Council of the American, or Know-nothing, party, which was then in session. It was as follows :

“PHILADELPHIA, PA., Feb. 22, 1856.

“The American party is no longer a unit. The national council has gone to pieces. Raise the Republican banner. The North Americans are with you.

THOMAS SPOONER.”

The dispatch was loudly cheered by the convention. Speech-making now became the order of the day, and Preston King, Charles Reemelin, George W. Julian, Joshua R. Giddings and D. Ripley, of New Jersey, all addressed the convention at some length. Mr. King spoke in his customary tone of kindness and conciliation, and his hopeful view of the progress of freedom and the outcome of the new movement was heartily responded to by the audience. By far the strongest speech of the convention was that of Charles Reemelin, then a prominent and influential German politician of

Cincinnati, who died a few years ago. His arraignment of Know-nothingism as a scheme of bigotry and intolerance, and a mischievous side-issue, was vigorous and unsparing. He was a Democrat, but the course of his party had made him an independent. He was a man of recognized ability and integrity, and his utterances were enthusiastically applauded. Mr. Julian spoke on the same subject and expressed kindred views. Mr. Giddings made one of his happiest efforts. He gave an amusing account of the recent struggle for the speakership which resulted in the election of Banks, interspersed with anecdotes which provoked roars of laughter and cheers. He was constitutionally hopeful, touching the progress of the anti-slavery cause, but recent events had given him new accessions of faith, and he poured himself forth in jubilant anticipations which seemed to be as delightful to his hearers as to himself. But the last speaker, Mr. Ripley, created the sensation of the day. He began by giving an account of his experience in the lumber business, and called himself "the saw-log man." The relevancy of his remarks to the business of the convention was exceedingly remote, and he was several times called to order; but the drollery of his effort and the flashes of humor which lighted up his backwoods style of oratory disarmed opposition, and he was allowed to proceed. It was said at the time that his speech rivalled the finest specimens of Yankee comedy. This closed the first day of the convention, and left its members in an enviable state of good humor. But it was not an accident. The Know-nothings had been subjected to pretty rough handling, and many believed that Mr. Greeley's counsel of "caution" and "moderation" had not been duly heeded. It was arranged, accordingly, that "the saw-log man" should be heard, as a diversion from the more serious work of the convention and a means of restoring general harmony and good-will.

When the convention assembled on the second day of its labors considerable time was occupied in listening to ten-minute speeches by representatives of the different states, giving an account of the progress of free principles in the various sections of the Union. A letter was then read from Cassius M. Clay, which was ordered to be printed. He was then in his prime, and it was one of the happiest of his notable public utterances. Its tone was in striking contrast with that of the paper submitted by Mr. Blair. The latter pleaded for moderation, and appealed to the spirit of compromise; but Clay pleaded for political courage and appealed to American manhood, while he invoked the spirit of our republican fathers in facing the despotism of the slave oligarchy. His words were shot and shell. As an impassioned and powerful arraignment of slavery

by a Southern man his letter reminded one of Jefferson's arraignment of George the Third, and through its extensive publication in the newspapers it must have done excellent service in guiding and inspiring the great party then about to be created.

As chairman of the committee on national organization, George W. Julian then submitted the report of that committee, which embodied the following recommendations :

1. The appointment of a national executive committee consisting of one from each state and constituted as follows : E. D. Morgan, New York, chairman ; George G. Fogg, New Hampshire ; N. P. Banks, Massachusetts ; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont ; John M. Niles, Connecticut ; William Chase, Jr., Rhode Island ; C. M. K. Pollison, New Jersey ; David Wilmot, Pennsylvania ; F. P. Blair, Jr., Missouri ; Rev. J. G. Fee, Kentucky ; A. J. Stevens, Iowa ; A. P. Stone, Ohio ; William Grose, Indiana ; E. D. Leland, Illinois ; Charles Dickey, Michigan ; Wyman Spooner, Wisconsin ; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia ; ex-Governor Alexander Ramsey, Minnesota.

2. That the National Executive Committee be authorized to add to their number from each state not now represented in said committee, and to fill vacancies.

3. The committee further recommend the holding of a Republican National Convention for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, the 17th day of June next, to be composed of delegates from the several states equal in number to twice the representation in Congress to which each state is entitled.

4. That the Republicans of the different states be recommended to complete their organization at the earliest practicable moment by the appointment of state, county and district committees ; and the state and county committees are requested to organize the respective counties by Republican clubs in every town or township throughout the land.

On motion of S. N. Wood, of Kansas, Gen. Charles Robinson of that territory was made an additional member of the National Executive Committee ; and the third recommendation, on the motion of Mr. Lovejoy, was amended so as to make the delegates to the national convention consist of three from each congressional district. The report of the committee on organization as thus amended was adopted, and the national Republican Party became a fact.

Mr. Mann, of New York, from the Committee on Address and Resolutions, now made his report. His address was very lengthy, occupying two hours in the reading, and was a pretty thorough

over-hauling of the slavery question in general, and particularly of the overthrow of the Missouri Compromise and the outrages in Kansas which followed. Its authorship was credited to Henry J. Raymond, of the *New York Times*, and it concluded as follows :

“ We therefore declare to the people of the United States as the objects for which we unite in political action :

“ 1. That we demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of slavery into territory now consecrated to freedom, and will resist by every constitutional means the existence of slavery in any of the territories of the United States ;

“ 2. We will support by every lawful means our brethren in Kansas in their constitutional and manly resistance to the usurped authority of their lawless invaders ; and we will give the full weight of our political power in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas to the Union as a free, sovereign and independent state ;

“ 3. Believing the present national administration has shown itself to be weak and faithless, and as its continuance in power is identified with the progress of the slave power to national supremacy, with the exclusion of freedom from the territories, and with unceasing civil discord, it is a leading purpose of our organization to oppose and overthrow it.”

These declarations might have gone farther, but they were substantially sufficient. They demanded the freedom of Kansas and all our national territories, which meant, of course, the restriction of slavery to the states in which it existed. Such restriction, the slaveholders believed, would pave the way for its destruction. It was because they believed that the Wilmot Proviso threatened slavery with gradual suffocation and ultimate death that they demanded the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise and organized their bloody raid into Kansas. Their policy was the expansion of slavery as the chosen means of saving its life and perpetuating its rule, while the Republican policy was the restriction of slavery as the chosen means of saving the life of the nation and preserving the principles of democracy. No issue could have been more vital, and on this issue a great national party now planted itself and entered upon its stormy career.

This convention represented all of the sixteen northern and eight of the southern states. Its members came together in the dead of winter, when no candidates were to be nominated and no offices were to be divided. Probably a majority of them had passed the meridian of life, but all seemed equally in earnest and absorbed in their work. A few of them were already known to political fame,

such as Joshua R. Giddings, Preston King and David Wilmot, while others, like Zachariah Chandler, Edwin D. Morgan, and Oliver P. Morton, were afterwards to become honorably conspicuous. The great body of the members had never devoted themselves to the business of politics, and this was indicated by the composition of the several committees selected by the convention for the execution of its work. It was a season of unparalleled political chaos, in which doubt and apprehension largely ruled the hour. Good men sometimes lost their way, or saw but dimly the path of safety. Politic statesmen took counsel of their fears. A number of notable men in the convention took little or no part in its proceedings. Many undoubtedly failed to attend because they thought it wiser to wait upon the teaching of events. It was the element of uncalculating radicalism which baffled the policy of timidity and hesitation and saved the cause. Of the nine Free Soilers who held the balance of power in the lower branch of the Congress of 1849, five were in this convention and among its active workers. The convention stood by them. Only five of the northern states had taken the initiative in calling it; but its members, most fortunately, had the courage of their convictions. Their devotion to the cause and singleness of purpose kept them steadfast. They could have had no conception of the magnitude of the work which they were beginning. They did not dream of the civil war which was to result from the splendid courage of the new party in standing by its principles, nor of the magnificent part it was to play in crushing a great slave-holders' rebellion. As little did they dream of the total extirpation of slavery in the United States in less than nine years, and its abolition throughout the civilized world which was to follow. They were building better than they knew. This was strikingly illustrated by Mr. Greeley's account of the convention in the *Tribune*, in which he said, "its moral and political effect will be felt for a quarter of a century." He did not see the greatness of the work which had been inaugurated, because the angle of his vision left it outside of his horizon; but he lived to see the curtain lifted, and to realize that the movement in which he had shared involved the life of the Republic, the emancipation of a race, and the grand march of democratic government towards its world-wide triumph.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

DOCUMENTS

I. Santiago, and the Freeing of Spanish America, 1741.

AFTER Admiral Vernon and General Wentworth had failed in their attack on Carthagena, they left that place, at the end of April and the beginning of May, 1741, and sailed to Jamaica. There on May 26 a council of war was held, consisting of Admiral Vernon and Sir Chaloner Ogle on the part of the naval forces and Generals Wentworth and Guise on the part of the army, together with the governor of the island, Edward Trelawny. The council, held at Santiago de la Vega (Spanish Town) is mentioned in Vernon's letter of May 30 to the Duke of Newcastle, printed in his *Original Papers relating to the Expedition to Carthagena*, London, 1744. (See pp. 126-128, 141.) But it is believed that the following minute of its determinations has never been printed. It is derived, by the courtesy of Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, Superintendent of the Manuscript Department in the Library of Congress, from the series of the "Vernon-Wager Navy Papers," in that library. This collection, bound in twelve large folio volumes, comprises many papers of great interest to students of colonial history.

It is perhaps unnecessary to recount the history of the expedition against Santiago de Cuba, resolved upon by this council of war. The military landed without opposition in the bay of Guantanamo, to which they gave the name of Cumberland, in honor of the royal duke. But on sending out parties to reconnoître, Wentworth received such accounts of the difficulty of taking Santiago, that he judged it most prudent to withdraw. Vernon unwillingly acquiesced, and the expedition came to nothing.

The other paper is derived from the same source. It is believed that it has never been printed, and that it will be thought to be of present interest. The endorsement indicates it as not the work of Vernon, but of Stephen DeVere or Devereux. The two manuscripts are designated as Nos. 12 and 19, respectively, in Vol. VI. of the Vernon-Wager Papers.

I. COUNCIL OF WAR AT SANTIAGO DE LA VEGA, MAY 26, 1741.

At a General Council of War held at His Excellency Governour Trelawny's at St Iago de la Vega, on the 26th day of May 1741.

M^r. Vernon having communicated to us, together with His Majesty's Instructions of the 10th July 1740, and the additional Instructions from my Lords Justices of the 25th September 1740, the Letters and Orders since receiv'd from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle of the 4th December, and the two of the 28th Febr'y last, and likewise, all the intercepted Letters (so providentially fallen into his hands, by Cap^t Warren's destroying of Valladon the Privateer from S^t Iago)¹ and the Intelligence sent him by Cap^t Lee, and what was further observ'd of the motions of the Ships from Cadiz, by Captain Peyton of the Kennington, who was sent here by Cap^t Lee, with these Advices of the nine Sail Men of War putting to Sea from Cadiz.

And Governour Trelawny having communicated to us, the favourable Disposition of the Gentlemen of this Island, to contributing to the Success of any Expedition that might be judg'd proper to be undertaken.

Your Council of War after maturely deliberating on the said Instructions, Orders, Letters, intercepted Intelligences, and Advices, and having regard to the great reduction of our Forces ;

It was the Opinion of the Council of War, that in regard to the Diminution of the Forces, the Security of this Island and our Trade, the Security of all Supplies coming to us, and preserving a Communication with this Island, for our Supplies ; the only Expedition that could be thought advisable to be undertaken, was against S^t Iago de Cuba, a Port of great Importance to the Security of our Trade, and cutting off the baneful Correspondence between them and Hispaniola.

And tho in regard to the general Sickness, that had spread itself thro' Fleet and Army, we were not in very good condition for undertaking any new Expedition ; yet on the assurance given us by the Governour Trelawny, that we might rely on a Supply from the Island, of a thousand of the most serviceable of their Blacks, they could raise in the Island, to be all chosen Men, and to have proper Officers, and through a sincere Zeal for doing the utmost in our power, to answer the expectations of Our Royal Master, from the great Expence of this Expedition ;

It was the Resolution of Your Council of War, to undertake this Expedition against S^t Iago, and to push it forward with all the dispatch, the Situation of our Affairs would admit of.

And M^r. Vernon having desir'd our Opinions, on that part of his Instructions of the 25th September, in regard to dispatching a proportionable number of his Ships home on those of the Enemies being return'd home, or destroyed, and represented to us the hazard, the unsheath'd eighty Gun Ships, and others of the most crazy of the Ships, would run, if they were not sent home to save a Summer's passage ; We concur'd with him in Opinion such ought to be dispatch'd home, so as a sufficient Force was reserv'd, in regard to the Spanish Squadron under Rodrigo de Torrez at the Havanna, and those mention'd to be under M. de Rochefeuil at Hispaniola.

¹ See Vernon's *Original Papers*, pp. 136, 137.

Santiago, and the Freeing of Spanish America, 1741 325

Given under our Hands at S^t Iago de la Vega the 26th day of May 1741.

E: Vernon

Tho^s Wentworth.

C: Ogle

J: Guise.

A Copy.

Since His Majesty's Forces have been so reduced by Sickness, I think the remaining number ought not to be hazarded, but on a Service that, if it succeed, may be of great Benefit and Importance to Great Britain.

I cannot think S^t Iago de Cuba of Consequence, while we are masters at Sea, and I think, it should be an inviolable Maxim, to be Superiours, as we may be, at Sea in the West Indies, or else, Possessions in the West Indies, will be a Detriment, instead of a Benefit, to Great Britain; and no Possessions but such as may be useful in Commerce, are for our Benefit.

Panama is of that nature, as it would command the Isthmus of Darien and therefore if there is Force enough, with the help of the Mosquito Indians, and Negroes under proper Officers from this Island, an Attempt upon that Place, would be in my Opinion most advisable.

Edw: Trelawny

A Copy.:

(Endorsed.)

General Council of War
held at S^t Iago de la Vega
the 26th May 1741, with Gov^r
Trelawny's Reasons for
dissenting from it

II. SOME THOUGHTS RELATING TO OUR CONQUESTS IN AMERICA,

JUNE 6, 1741.

Our success at Carthage, says many a hearty Briton, will, if the blow be properly followd, make us masters of all Spanish America. Conquest is allowed to be a good title. If we keep what we conquer we shall have the Trade of all the Spanish West Indies in our own hands.

I am far from envying my Country so much Glory and Riches; but, I believe we shall have more of both if we limit our desires.

Admitting us in quiet possession of all Spanish America. To keep that possession we must do, as the Spaniards have done before us, we must have strong garisons and Colonies. This will estrange our hands and treasure, and we shall soon be in a worse condition than the Spaniards themselves.

Besides: Such a conquest, supposing us equal to the vast undertaking, will make us the Envy of our Neighbours. Attempting to engross trade is like aiming at universal monarchy; it will raise such a Confederacy against us, as we cannot withstand: A wise man would never grasp at what he cannot hope to hold.

What shall we do then, you will say, now we are masters of the American Seas? shall we plunder and destroy their towns, and lay all waste before us? By no means. This will be carrying on the war in a piratical barbarous manner, without benefit to any but to the adventurers. But by so doing shall we not the sooner compel the King of Spain to allow us a free navigation in the American seas without Search? Such cruelty may have a different offset. But if it should bring the Spaniards to a Treaty, and if a peace were made in the most explicit terms, yet we can have no hopes of its lasting long, without our having some cautionary town in our hands; and our having such a place in our hands will draw upon us the Envy of others. But may we not keep a town or two, and thence carry on a Separate trade with the natives? The Spaniard will never consent to this: and the retaining such places by force, while the King of Spain continues Lord of America, will be attended with the same inconveniences, in proportion, as aiming at an entire Conquest. But may we not compel the King of Spain to open his ports in America, and give a free trade to all nations? and will not this take off the Envy of others? I believe none will envy us such a Romantic Enterprise, in which we can expect no Success, and if we had the greatest, it would not answer the purpose.

I am far from thinking that opening a free trade for all nations to the Spanish dominions in America would be of any injury to us. For whoever considers the Situation, and native riches of Great Britain and Ireland, and of our Colonies in America, can never think that we shall be out traded to Spanish America by any nation whatsoever, if we can have but the common discernment, not to obstruct our own trade.

I shall not take any pains to prove the advantage of our Situation, as being well known. And I shall but just mention two articles of our native riches, I mean food and manufactures: if these two articles be duly encouraged we shall out trade all the world in Spanish America. Nor do I think it impracticable to open all the ports of Spanish America, if a proper method were followed.

Supposing now that we had reduced the King of Spain to submit to an open trade to all his ports in America, and that he is still to continue King of his American dominions: all, in my opinion, that can be stipulated in this case is, that, instead of carrying goods from all parts of Europe to old Spain (wth goods, as the trade now lies, are to be carried thence, in the King of Spain's Ships, to his plantations in America) all nations shall be at liberty to carry their goods directly to his ports in America: that such a duty shall be paid by the importer, as shall be regulated: that a cautionary town, with a proper territory, shall be left in the hands of his Britanic majesty, and successors in trust for the due performance of this treaty: that the garison shall be maintained by an impost on all Ships touching there: and that all the naval powers of Europe shall be guarantees of this treaty.

The King of Spain, by such a treaty, being admitted to be absolute Sovereign of his American dominions, he must be allowed to govern

those dominions in what manner he thinks fit, and, consequently, to keep up his viceroies, and all the rest of his officers, his garisons, and his fleets: and, in order to Support all this charge; the impost on goods imported directly into the ports of America must be very high, perhaps little inferior to the Indulto now laid on them in old Spain, and, if so the freetrader will receive but small benefit by this alteration in the chanel of trade.

Our keeping a cautionary town will give great offence to the naval powers of Europe. I doubt whether our friends the Dutch will allow of it.

But the great difficulty will be in reducing the King of Spain to submit to such conditions. For, by this Scheme, Spanish America is still to continue under the tyranny of old Spain, a tyranny they have long groaned under, and which they are ready to shake off, whenever they shall have a proper opportunity. But if they find that all intended by us, is only to chastise the King of Spain, and to suffer him still to Lord it over them, they will not give us the least assistance, and without the assistance of the Natives we can never expect to lay open the ports of new Spain; but, with their help, we shall do it, in spite of all the powers of Europe. And if we enter into alliance with them, as with free people, we shall have a new, and just title to carry on the war in defense of our allies, and therefore we may hope it will be prosperous

It well becomes a free people to place others in the same condition with themselves. To deliver so many nations from Tyranny will be truer Glory than Alexander gained by all his Victories. Let me add to this, that we shall thereby greatly increase our own Riches, w^{ch} is the end of all conquests: and we shall do it without raising the just envy of our neighbours, w^{ch} is likely to make our happiness the more lasting. Because, Spanish America being free, their trade, like that of other free nations, will be equally free to all in Amity with them. Even old Spain itself will find the benefit of it, if their pride will permit them to turn merchants.

This will not be the first time that the Subjects of the King of Spain recovered their liberties, and with our help. Our glorious Queen Elizabeth was the great instrument, under god, of making the poor distressed States a free people. Their own industry made them rich, and they are still our good allies. Our posterity may expect to find their best allies in Spanish America.

By Spanish America I mean not only the original Americans, but also the new Americans, or descendants from the Spaniards. Let them all be free: and let them all settle their own respective governments in what manner they shall think fit. The more Government the better. The Romans made use of this very method in helping Greece, when oppressed by the King of Macedon, and with success.

To set Spanish America thus free must needs be a great undertaking, and a work of time: but this ought not to discourage us: for the war will maintain itself: I mean that our trade to the ports first opened will bring us in wealth enow to support the war.

If we proceed upon this plan and in earnest, we may expect to meet with success abroad, and with, what is better, peace at home : So be it.
June 6, 1741.

(Endorsed in a different hand.)

6 June 1741

Some Thoughts relating
to our Conquests in America.

(Endorsed in Vernon's hand)

M^r. Steph D^eVeros.

2. *Letters to Caleb Strong, 1786, 1800.*

SOME years ago the Rev. S. C. Strong, a great-grandson of Caleb Strong, presented to the Historical and Natural History Society of South Natick, Massachusetts, a collection of letters addressed to his ancestor. They are now in the museum of that society, close by the site of John Eliot's Indian church. By the kindness of Mr. Gustavus Smith, president of the society, we are permitted to print the two following letters. At the time when the first letter was written, Caleb Strong (1745-1819) was a member of the Massachusetts senate. He was a member of the United States Senate (Federalist) from 1789 to 1796, and governor of Massachusetts from 1800 to 1807 and from 1812 to 1816. Theodore Sedgwick, who succeeded Strong in the Senate, and from 1799 to 1801 was Speaker of the House of Representatives, was in 1786 a member of the Continental Congress. His letter illustrates by an early instance the disunion sentiment of New England Federalists. The letter from Dwight Foster, Senator from Massachusetts 1800-1803, casts light upon those events of the election in South Carolina in 1800 which were illustrated by the series of letters printed in the last number of this REVIEW, pp. 111-129.

1. THEODORE SEDGWICK TO CALEB STRONG.

New York 6. August, 1786.

My dear Sir,

By the last post I had the pleasure to receive your letter of the 28th ult. the contents convey evidence of such a disposition in my countrymen as must give pain to every well disposed mind.

The affairs of the continent are in such circumstances as afford no balance to the disorders of the particular states. Should Massachusetts fall into anarchy the great prop of the union would be prostrate. For altho the public conduct of Massachusetts when viewed by itself would not strongly inspire veneration, yet when compared with any other State in the union, the comparison will irresistably compel conviction that her

councils produce measures more the result of wisdom and integrity than any other.

Our commissioners are returned from the *mediterranean* without effecting anything, no reasonable hope of any other event could have been formed. The interest of every commercial and maritime power in europe opposes ours as related to this object, and Great Britain, which is in strict friendship with the pirates would go great lengths in gratifying her malice and jealousy to defeat our purpose. congress have not yet come to any ultimate decision on this subject. I have formed my opinion as to policy in the object to be persued, but this must not at present be put on paper.

No reasonable expectations of advantage can be formed from the commercial convention.¹ The first proposers designed none. the measure was originally brought forward with an intention of defeating the enlargement of the powers of Congress. Of this I have the most decisive evidence. It well becomes the eastern and middle States, who are in interest one, seriously to consider what advantages result to them from their connection with the Southern States. They can give us nothing, as an equivalent for the protection which they derive from us but a participation in their commerce. This they deny to us. Should their conduct continue the same, and I think there is not any prospect of an alteration, an attempt to perpetuate our connection with them, which at last too will be found ineffectual, will sacrifice everything to a meer chimera. Even the appearance of a union cannot in the way we now are long be preserved. It becomes us seriously to contemplate a substitute ; for if we do not controul events we shall be miserably controuled by them. No other substitute can be devised than that of contracting the limits of the confederacy to such as are natural and reasonable, and within those limits instead of a nominal to institute a real, and an efficient government.

This language will appear to you I am affraid as evidence of pusillanimity, but I do not think that in politics I am timid.

We have made another requisition which includes such part of the principal of the foreign debt as will become payable next year. to this measure I gave my assent not from any apprehension that it would produce any considerable effect, but because I wish congress may do her duty. Several of the States have never passed any acts in persuance of the requisition of 84, not half on that of last year and still less is to be expected from the present.

It will be unnecessary to inform you that this letter is wrote with great haste and in that confidence of your friendship which I have long flattered myself I was so happy as to possess. Some matters of very great importance but with regard to which secrecy at present is enjoined will detain me here a little longer. As soon as these are completed which I hope will be the case in 8 or 10 days I shall again return to the vale of private life. There confiding in the wisdom of Doctor Holten that all

¹ At Annapolis.

things will be happily adjusted I will seek contentment.—Compt^s I pray you to M^{rs} S.

I am my dear Sir,
Your sincerely affect^{ed}
THEODORE SEDGWICK

M^r Strong.

II. DWIGHT FOSTER TO CALEB STRONG.

City of Washington Dec. 12th 1800

My dear Sir,

I thank you for your Favour of the 29th ult^o which came to Hand in due course by the Mail. I was happy to learn that so much unanimity with honourable Principles had prevailed in the Legislature of Massachusetts in the appointment of Electors. If as You supposed the late Election had depended on Pennsylvania we had been safe. The opposition gained only the advantage of one Majority by the Electors in that State. Far more important was the Vote of South Carolina; all depended on the success of the federal Ticket at Columbia and there our last hopes have been defeated. The Election came on upon the 2nd inst. There were present 115 members of the House of Representatives and 36 of the Senate, making the whole number 151; of which 76 were a majority. The Tickets and numbers for each of the nominees were as follows.

Federal		Antifederal	
Gen'l Washington	69	Robert Anderson	85
John Ward	69	John Hunter	87
W ^m Falconer	64	A. Simpkins	84
Col ^o J. Postell	66	Wade Hampton	82
Capt. Blasingame	66	A. Love	82
Gen'l M ^o Pherson	66	Theo. Gaillard	85
H ^r Dana Ward	63	Paul Hamilton	87
Thomas Roper	67	Joseph Blythe	82

Mr. DeSaussure the Writer states that they could have easily formed a Ticket composed of Men who would have been appointed by a great Majority for the Election of Jefferson and Pinckney. Many who were extremely anxious to support Jefferson proposed to the Federalists to form a Ticket uniting the Interests of Jefferson and Pinckney being at the same time deeply reluctant to give up Gen'l P. but on the most mature Deliberation it was deemed the wisest and most honourable to adhere to the federal arrangements heretofore made for the equal support of Mr. Adams and Gen'l Pinckney.

The General is a Member of the Legislature and was present. he firmly resisted every Inducement to be associated with Jefferson at the Expense of Mr. Adams. Both he and our other Friends there have in the whole transaction behaved in the most honourable Manner. He has shown himself worthy of the Honours which we wished to have conferred

upon him by his appointment to the office of Vice President. I hope it will appear that like honourable Principles, without a single Exception, have prevailed throughout New England. The successful Party in S^c Carolina say that the Electors are pledged to support Jefferson and Burr! Such is the result and these are the Men who are to sustain the two most distinguished offices in the Federal Government. The Change is great; —but if we can avoid being conducted into a French Port we may esteem ourselves yet to be fortunate. I hope the danger may be avoided but if the War in Europe shall continue, the Danger will be imminent. It is of infinite moment to prevent the poison already too deeply infused in New England from becoming more virulent. The preservation of our ancient Institutions is an object of the first magnitude.

These by vigilance and attention may be preserved, and if they shall be we may yet stand on safe Ground.

With respect to our accommodations here they are much better than we expected to find. The settlement still is, and for a long Time must continue to be in a rude state. The Trees have been cut away and the Fences have been removed. the place bears more the appearance of an encamping ground than of a City. it is susceptible of Improvement, but I trust will never be brought to Perfection in the manner contemplated by many of those who favoured the Removal of the Government to this Place. I mean at the expense of the United States. There are several very good Houses and many small ones; but they are sparsely situate and the publick Buildings planted so far from each other that great Inconveniences are experienced.

I have written to Gen^l Putnam relative to the Taxes on your shares in the Ohio Purchase and as soon as I can ascertain the amount, I will, according to your Request remit to him the money necessary to discharge them.

Mr. Hillhouse and I continue to be Fellow Lodgers. we have with us Messrs Chauncey and Elizur Goodrich Nathan Read and T. Foster, Mr. Nott of S^c Carolina and Gen^l Dickson of N^c Carolina, and we consider ourselves as very fortunate in having obtained Lodgings in a good House with an agreeable Family and near the Capitol.

I am Dear Sir with great
affection and Esteem Your
Friend and obed^t Servant
DWIGHT FOSTER

His Excellency
Gov. Strong.

3. *Letters to Secretary Chase from the South, 1861.*

THE following letters are selected from those written to Salmon P. Chase during the year 1861. In two cases, Richard Ela, April 12, and T. D. Winter, June 10, the letters are reports made at Mr. Chase's special request. Mrs. Hunt was a sister of Mr. Chase's

third wife, being married to Randall Hunt and resident in New Orleans. Most of the other letters are from men not among Chase's usual correspondents.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

I. J. MCCORMICK TO CHASE.

Augusta Georgia

March 6-61

Salmon P. Chase

Hond Sir,

The responsible, and influential position you now occupy; and the threatening aspect of affairs, induces me as an old personal acquaintance, and one who has not been unfriendly to you, to address you.

I have been living in this City and State for the last twenty months, and have not been blind to what has taken place around me. I have been in contact with, and learned the opinions of all classes of people; I have noted the rise, progress and character, of the revolution which has taken place; and therefore can speak with knowledge, of what has been done; that which is; and the present determination as to the future; and entertaining the opinions which I do, I kneed not add, that I deeply deplore the present situation of affairs.

Sir, argue as much, and as wisely as we may, that, by the law of the Constitution, the whole territory of the U. S. of six months since, is yet the territory of the U. S.: in fact, it is not true.

In law, the thirteen colonies were a part of the British empire, until the peace of '83. In law Mexico, Bolivia, Peru were a part of the empire of Spain for twenty years after Spain had ceased to have any authority over them, or, more recently, Texas was in law a part of Mexico, until the treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo; yet in fact none of these legal propositions were true; and the existence of the mere legal abstract truths, did not falsify the material fact, that these several Colonies and States, were not a part of the governments from which they had separated themselves. The same principle which applied to them, applies equally to the seceding States which were recently a part of the empire of the U. S.

That the empire is severed, is a fact, in practical existence. That a new government, *foreign to the government of the U. S.* has been organized is a fact in practical existence. That this new government recognizes no right of control, in the government of the U. S. is a fact in practical existence; and these practical facts are hostile to, and subversive of the abstract legal fact, announced in the Inaugural address of the President of the U. S.

Let me assure you Sir; these practical existing facts will be maintained. If your mind is influenced by the idea, that the seceding States will again become a part of the U. S. until the experiment has been tried, and the minds of men are materially changed, disabuse yourself of it at once. There are not in the Confederate States, one thousand men, who

will not sacrifice all—property, life, every thing but honor, or that which they believe to be honor, for the maintenance of their present position. In this I am not mistaken. True, there are many Union men in the South, many good, honest, honorable, patriotic men, who regret the separation ; but the separation being made ; they know, they seek for no alternative. They are with their State and the new government, and with them alone.

These things being so ; it is for the U. S. to decide the momentous question of peace or war, now impending ; and you Sir, are one of those who must make that decision.

If you should determine for the latter ; and the enforcement of the laws is such a determination ; you enter upon a terrible contest, a contest at war with every principle of self-government and every recognized American principle of political rights, and combat the principles, for which you yourselves contend. This is much, but more remains.

Sir, you cannot conquer the South. You may destroy her prosperity ; you may annihilate her people, but you cannot conquer them. You may launch your troops upon her, you may batter down her cities, you may carry fire, rapine and murder among her peaceful dwellings, and by this annihilation you may obtain a jurisdiction over her territory, but it will be a jurisdiction over nothing but ruins.

To a good man, a proposition fraught with such consequences, must be horrible. Barbarism or savage fanaticism alone, could exult over it ; and I will not believe you are in any manner allied to the latter without convincing proof of a fact so revolting.

In this picture I have granted your power in arms, not because the fact is so ; but because its discussion is unnecessary. But I grant it for the results ; and what are they ? I have said what they would be to the South ; to you, they would be, a bankrupt government, a ruined commerce, impoverished States and a demoralized people. With these facts staring you in the face, having destroyed the South, will you have any cause for rejoicings at home ?

In Gods name let there be peace, Settle the affair amicably. Let the language of Abraham to Lot control your councils, and although clouds may lour for a while, there will be sunshine hereafter. We cannot hope to make this a real land of Beulah ; but near approaches are not denied to us.

You have ever said I was too violent ; will you not permit me to caution you against violence now ? and believe me Sir to be with the highest consideration, Yours, &c.

J. McCORMICK.

II. RICHARD ELA TO CHASE.

Washington 12th April 1861

Sir :

In compliance with your request, I respectfully submit the following statement of the state of political feeling at the Southwest as far as it

came under my observation during my late visit to Mobile and New Orleans.

My business in that region was of a private character, arising from the estate left by lately deceased brother who had been for more than twenty years a trader at Mobile, and who had named me Executor of his will. During the ten days I was in that city, that estate occupied my attention and brought me into contact with many individuals of various classes and pursuits.

I was very much surprised at the apparent unanimity of that population in support of the secession policy. For some months past I have been generally aware of the professed alarm of people from the South in regard to their rights and property—but I was unprepared to find such a unanimity among them. Without in any instance having introduced conversation on political subjects, I think every person with whom I had business in Mobile, addressed me questions as to the probable course of the Government at Washington towards the South. My reply to such questions was, that I had no means of knowing the intention of the Government beyond the views expressed in the Presidents inaugural address, and the course of its supporters during the late session of Congress—that I did not believe the Government contemplated any hostile measure, but it was bound to execute the laws as far as practicable.

Sometimes this led to further discussions the particulars of which it is impossible for me to recollect and state. The upshot was, that every person with whom I held conversation, whether originally from the North or South, expressed the firmest determination to support the Confederate States, as the only mode of preserving their rights and property. Perhaps the best mode of giving you a general idea of the mixture of argument and feeling which pervaded their conversations, will be the endeavor to state the leading points of a discussion I had with one of the most enterprising and successful traders at Mobile, like my brother a native of New Hampshire who had been on the most intimate social relations with him for many years. He is a private gentleman with whose frankness and practical views I had been most favorably impressed, and I accordingly took occasion to lead him into a full expression of his opinions, which I now give the substance of, though not intended by him to be repeated.

He remarked that for himself he was most anxious that relations of peace and amity should be preserved between the North and South, which he now regarded as wholly impossible under one Government. That the people of the North had been gradually brought to the settled and conscientious belief that slavery was the most abominable of all sins in the sight of God and man, while the people of the South sincerely believed that it was the most beneficent of all forms of servile labor and its protection was essential to the public and private prosperity of that region. With these radically conflicting views he said it was preposterous to suppose that one Government would satisfy both sections, and the best course was for them to separate peaceably, and each section pursue

its own path of duty and interest. That the present administration had been brought into power solely by the feeling of hostility to the institutions of the South, and that section did not intend that the Congress of the United States should usurp the power exercised by the National Convention of France and make their country another S'Domingo. Abolitionism had obtained a majority of votes, and got the control of the General Government of the United States—there was then no alternative for the South but to secede from the Union. Self preservation had compelled secession. He was neither a lawyer nor metaphysician and did not know, or care, whether under the Constitution, the States had or had not a right to secede—it was sufficient for him, that the election of the present administration upon the doctrines, and by the efforts of the abolitionists, was in fact a revolution—he was willing to accept it and abide by the consequences of resisting its government.

I remarked that so far from the present Government being under the control of abolitionists, it seemed to me as certain as any thing that could be known of any man's private opinions, that the President was not an abolitionist, nor even any of the members of his cabinet so far as I could understand. That even were such their opinions, under the Constitution no law could be passed by Congress, which would affect slave property in the States.

He replied that he did not assert that the President was an abolitionist—he did not pretend to know whether he or any of his cabinet were or were not—but the point was, they had been brought into power by abolition principles and votes, and this was enough to justify secession by the South. That the result had proved that the South were correct in taking that step. The administration had been compelled whether abolitionists or not, to bestow some of its most important appointments on persons who had no public character or standing except as abolitionists, and their measures would of necessity be of the same hue. As to constitutional power, it was not worth while to speak of that, when the positive obligation to surrender fugitive slaves could not be enforced from the state of public feeling in the North. Under that feeling, there could be no safety from continual encroachment on the rights and property of the South. At any rate said he, we have determined not to expose ourselves to such hazards. We intend to protect ourselves, if it costs everything we have.

I enquired whether the views he expressed were generally entertained by the people of Mobile?

He replied that he was regarded as he believed, to be an exception from the moderation of his opinions, and his desire to preserve peace. It could not be otherwise with him, as his principal connexions in business were with the North. Many earnest, impressible people were in favor of immediate and active war, until the North were willing to cease their abuse of, and interference with, Southern institutions, with which they had no concern or responsibility. For himself, he was wholly opposed to hostilities except in self defense. But should the administration

at Washington attempt to collect revenue here, a bloody war is inevitable, as the South will choose to be exterminated to the last man, rather than submit to such a state of things.

The foregoing brief exposition of the views of this gentleman, is according to my best recollection of their substance during a conversation of more than an hour. From the conversation and remarks I heard in Cars, at Public Houses and other places of general resort during my passage through and sojourn in the Cotton States it seemed to me that his views were among the most moderate and measured I noticed, after crossing the line of Tennessee. While in Mobile I had occasion to visit several respectable families, and it struck me that the females from all I saw and heard, were quite as earnest and zealous as the men.

This state of things so much to be regretted, seems to be general in the Cotton States, so far as I had means of judging of the tone of public opinion. In Alabama Mississippi and Louisiana which I traversed, not an expression in favor of the Union came under my notice except what was made by myself in the various conversations I held. Every where in those States, the people appeared to be enthusiastic in favor of the separte government of the Confederate States.

While at Mobile I accidentally met Mr. Cobb, late Secretary of the Treasury on his way from Montgomery to New Orleans. He appeared rejoiced to see me, carried me to his room and conversed freely on the policy of the Confederate States until interrupted by the calls of several gentlemen. From the tenor of his remarks it was evident that he did not consider resumption of the former connections between the seceded States and the United States to be expedient or practicable. From all I saw and heard it seems to me that it will not be brought about, until the Seceded States shall have fully experienced the charges and responsibilities of separate Government.

Very respectfully

Your obed Sert

RICHARD ELA

Hon. S. P. Chase

Secretary of the Treasury.

III. MRS. RANDALL HUNT TO CHASE.

New Orleans May 30th 1861.

My dear Brother

I have determined to avail myself of the opportunity offered by the few days of grace, yet remaining before mails are closed, to write to you once more.

First, let me thank you for your prompt and kind answer to my former letter. I did not reply to it, because I had nothing to write that could interest you, beyond what was in the newspapers. I did not have it published because there was nothing in it calculated to satisfy or quiet the discontented or excited people.

There was something in your letter however, so practical and bearing so directly on the course which should be pursued at present by the United States, that I have frequently thought I ought perhaps to present it to your continued reflection.—Pardonnez moi. I would not appear presumptuous, I desire only to suggest.

What I refer to in your letter, is your condemnation of the attempt to delude the people, as to the settled opinion of any part of the country, and of the folly of evasion. “Let us,” you say, “recognize facts as they are, frankly and boldly, and not creep away from them.”

You have an enlarged and cultivated mind. The times call for the highest exercise of patriotism and statesmanship. The question which you have in a good degree to determine is, shall the country have peace or war? war, not with a foreign enemy, but civil and fratricidal war, the most cruel and bloody that history will ever know; bringing poverty, ruin famine and vice in its horrid train. Do not delude yourself or others with the notion that war can maintain the Union. Alas I say it with a heavy heart, the Union is destroyed, it can never be restored. If indeed the federal government had frowned upon the first dawning of disunion, things might have been different: But the U. S. suffered South Carolina to secede without opposition, and with scarcely a murmur of disapprobation. Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Texas, in a word all the Southern States, with the exception of Kentucky Missouri and Maryland, have joined in the secession, and have formed themselves into a powerful confederacy of States, with a government possessing all the usual powers of sovereignties, exercising entire and exclusive sway, legislative, executive, and judicial, within the limits of those states, and dissolving all connection with the U. S. Having thus by a revolution hitherto almost bloodless, assumed and exercised the right of self-government, the Confederate States are now threatened with war and desolation, if they do not abjure the government they have formed, and renounce forever the right of altering or abolishing that government, no matter how oppressive or despotic it may become.

The time has passed for a discussion about the territories, and fugitive slaves, and the constitutional right of a state to secede. Secession has proved to be a revolution, the overthrow of the constitution, the dissolution of the Union. Still secession is *un fait accompli*. Disunion is a fixed fact. It is worse than useless to deny or attempt to evade this truth.

The question then to be determined, is not, shall the Union be maintained, but, shall the Confederate States be allowed to govern themselves? And this is a question of liberty and free government.

And how do the statesmen of the North, how do you my dear Brother, who should recognize facts as they are, propose to deal with this question? With sword and buckler, the rifle, the bayonet, and the musket, the cannon and all the dread instruments of war! with infantry, and cavalry, and ships, and navies, and armies.

With these you propose to subjugate the entire free people of the

South, while you mock them, with the declaration that your object is to maintain a Union, which no longer exists. Is this wise, just, quite in keeping with the spirit of christianity and of liberty, and with the lofty character of the U. S. ? Would you desire a union of compulsion—a union to be maintained by the bayonet—a union with hatred and revenge filling the hearts of the North, and of the South. I hope you would not. But if you would the thing is impossible. You can never subjugate the South—never. Her people are highspirited martial and intelligent. Educated in the school of American liberty, they value the right of self government above all price, they believe that governments are instituted among men to secure the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that their just powers are derived from the consent of the governed. They view the attempt to conquer them, and compel them to submit to the gov't. of their victors as an effort of high-handed tyranny and oppression. You may for the moment have an advantage in wealth and numbers: But the South (and especially this part of the South) has the advantage of a climate which is death to northern soldiers, while it is health giving to the Southern. Besides the North is fighting for subjugation and domination, the South for liberty and independence. It is precisely like the great revolutionary struggle of '76 against the tyranny of G. B. —a struggle for liberty on one side, and for despotism on the other. How can you expect victory in such a cause? You know the power and resources of the South, her agricultural products her cotton tobacco sugar, the extent and fertility of her soil, the number of her inhabitants, the intimate connection of her interests with the industrial interests of Europe. England and France are already sympathising with her, and watch for an opportunity of acknowledging her sovereignty and independence. Her armies in the field equal your own in numbers, and are under the command of able and renowned officers. Surely eight millions of people, armed with the holy cause of liberty in such a country as they possess, are invincible by any force the North can send against them. Suppose what is not probable—suppose you should gain a victory, or two or more over the South, do you imagine that this would lead the way to submission? No, believe me, it might lead to a guerilla warfare, to a warfare like that carried on in former days by Marion and Sumpter and others who were content to live in swamps and fastnesses coming out as occasion offered to attack the invaders of their soil, and finally driving them off and gaining liberty. But there would be this difference. The South is now united to a man. There is no division among the people here. There is but one mind, one heart, one action. Do not suffer yourself to be misled with the idea, that there are union men in the South. There is not a man here who will not resist the arms of the North. The action of Mr. Lincoln and his cabinet has made them all of one mind.

I will tell you what I see here in the City. Every night the men are drilling. Young and old, professional men and laborers, lawyers, doctors, and even the ministers are all drilling. The shops are closed at six

that the clerks may go to their drilling. The ladies hold fares make clothes lint etc. for the army, and animate the men by appeals to their chivalry and their patriotism to resist the enemy to the death. What is seen in N. O. pervades the whole South. Never were a people more united and more determined. I solemnly believe that if the war now scarce begun shall go on, the North will suffer as much, if not more than the South, and they will finally be compelled to acknowledge the independence of the latter.

Why not do this then at once? Why not separate in peace? Why not avoid all the dreadful evils of this war?

You will wonder I suppose why I am writing to you who are so much abler than I to form a correct judgement in this matter, but I want you to know the feelings of the Southern people, and not to take council alone with narrow minded men of one idea, men who see nothing but the freedom of the negro, in the destruction of a noble country, and the overthrow of a noble government. Think of this, and what my feelings must be with my nearest and dearest relatives and friends arrayed against each other in a contest for Liberty.

I have always loved and respected you. Your abilities and character enable you to exercise a great, if not a controlling influence over the policy of the U. S. It was reported some six weeks ago that you were in favor of letting the South go in peace. I hope the report is true, and that you will exert yourself to ward off the calamity of war. If you succeed in the effort the country will bless you. Your name will be familiar as a household word and go down from generation to generation, and religion and liberty will ever hail you as their champion.

I close this appeal to you my dear Brother. I have not done justice to the subject. My heart and mind suggest many things more, but I will not tire you further.

Mr. Hunt has gone up to the camp to take leave of his brother and his nephew who are ordered off to-morrow. I suppose my own dear brothers will soon go off to fight and perhaps to fall in this cruel wicked war. Oh God help us.—The authors of it will be cursed from many an aching heart ere long.

Give my love to my dear little Nettie, and to Kate. I hoped this spring to have fitted up the dear old Station to pass our summers there. Its doors would have been as hospitable as in former days. I hoped to have passed many a happy day there with my relations. And I assure you that you and your children were among the happiest anticipations. But my chateaux en Espagne have been rudely thrown to the ground. If we women were at the helm of state our tender hearts would have settled these difficulties long before it came to this.

Farewell. Listen I pray you to my entreaty. It is not my prayer alone, it is the echo of every American heart. May God enlighten you and lead you in the paths of wisdom, virtue and liberty.

Very truly and affectionately yours

R. L. H.

IV. T. D. WINTER TO CHASE.

Washington City June 10/61

Hon Salmon P. Chase

Secretary of the Treasury

Sir

I have taken an early opportunity at your request to lay before you a Statement of the Condition of Affairs in those portions of the Seceded States which I have had occasion to be thrown into during the past few months, and in so doing I shall give you the facts as near as my personal observation has been able to glean and which reaches as late a period as the first of the present month, on all points bearing on the political, commercial and military condition of those portions of the secession States which I have been in, together with the Topography of those portions of the States which in future may be needed as the Channels for the Transportation of Troops into the disaffected States.

When I arrived in Memphis last fall I found the political feeling in that city strongly Union, and ardently advocating the claims of Mr. Bell for the Presidency ; with but one Exception I think the press of that city were with the Union party except the Memphis Avalanche, which has always been extremely Secession in its view.

Political Feeling

After the Presidential Election which placed Mr. Lincoln as President Elect before the people, the Union men and the Union Press although defeated in their great object, strongly opposed the feeling of secession, that seemed to be gaining ground, and though they felt no sympathy with the administration yet they strongly recommended that the administration have a fair commencement and that if the just rights of the South was conceded they could live as well under a Republican administration as any other. This position was maintained until even after all the other states had gone out with the Exception of Virginia, and when she seceded and the evacuation of Fort Sumpter took place, and still later until Mr. Bell made his wonderful leap into the Secession Ranks when the Union press placed the secession Flag at the head of their Columns.

With all the array of the press of Tennessee against the Union I do not think it has changed the sentiment of a large number of its patrons ; I do know that in the City of Memphis and in the State there are yet a good number of citizens, who are deeply devoted to the Union, and if they cannot express their sentiments outwardly they will, or have already done so within a day or two past at the Ballot Box, provided Mob Law has not reigned supreme, which I am much afraid will be the case in Memphis. The class of men as a general thing who advocate the doctrine of Secession as far as I have been able to see are men who have nothing to lose and everything to gain ; who have had the truth kept from them, and the impression instilled into their minds that the North-

ern States together with the administration are endeavoring to ruin them, and deprive them of all rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

That they have been deeply misled by their vile leaders, and their minds poisoned by the statements daily set forth by the organs of that party is well known. But my firm belief is that should an army formidable enough to control as they went, march into the South and show to the masses that they came only to execute the laws and protect their *slave* property the current of feeling would change materially, and there are *many* Union men in East and West Tennessee and Northern Alabama who will do their utmost in assisting the troops in carrying out the laws of the Country.

Let the ringleaders of this organization be laid hold of and the rest will soon subside

Commerce and Supplies

In a commercial point of view Memphis is a point that has been steadily increasing in trade, but the present state of affairs has completely prostrated her markets, and when I left there little or nothing was doing compared to what it was last fall. The quantity of Cotton on hand was but small and the season being over, that portion of the trade will be dull until the new crop comes in.

The condition of the provision market begins to excite more serious thought than anything else; they tell you that they have any quantity of provisions, but on an examination that I made in most of the provision Houses I should judge the stock very limited, and if the Louisville market is not supplying them, which they will not do without the Cash in advance and that in Kentucky funds or gold and silver, I see no source from which they can draw their supplies, for New Orleans has none to spare.

Fresh Beef is not plenty, and what there is, is only a middling quality.

Your early and prompt action in issuing orders to the officials at Cairo for the Seizure of all articles that would in any measure assist the South has very much retarded their operations for I do know that Thousands of Dollars worth of provisions had been ordered from St. Louis which has been their principal market and could they have gained a few weeks more, would have given them an opportunity to have laid in such a stock of Salt provisions as would have lasted them for months, and supplies of Ammunition they were depending upon are now in our hands.

I hold the idea that Memphis is the most important point we could obtain and that from its high location and the amount of Forest which surrounds it, no more eligible Spot Could be found for the quartering of the troops than that point, and I do not think the heat any greater than at Cairo, while it is exempt from the fogs and miasmas and damp dews which morning and evening rises over that point.

Number and Disposition of Troops

When I left Memphis there was not military force in the city except the "Home Guard" which is composed of Infantry and Cavalry.

The encampments are at the following places

Germantown on M and C R R	4000	Troops
Corinth " " " " "	8000	"
Union City on M and O R R	4500	"
Jackson " " "	8000	"
Fort Wright and Randolph	2500	"
At Camp Rector opp Mem 2 Reg	27000	

I think the Numbers are somewhat less but it will not vary a great deal from above statement

Some of the troops which left were comfortably equipped, while many had no military clothing, their arms were mostly what was taken from the Baton Rouge and Little Rock Arsenals, and were the old flint locks altered to Percussions.

I saw no Minnie or Maynard Rifles except in private hands

Two companies who came on the same train with me as far as Union City were a very unsoldierly set of men and badly officered

The best appearing and best drilled Regiments as far as I have seen are the Mississippi Regt, but None of them have the stamina or soldierly bearing that marks the companies that I have Seen Since my return North

My opinion is that our soldiers have far the advantage of them in discipline strength and better officers.

The Topography of the Country

As to that portion of the Country which will be of any particular interest, and over which I have travelled, I could see no great obstacles to overcome

From Memphis to Humboldt over the Memphis and Ohio R R is 81 miles through woods with here and there scattered plantations only 1 bridge about 175 feet long over the Big Hatchie River balance small trestle works, no heavy Grades on roads From Humboldt to Columbus City is 62 miles, country woody, no great impediments

Fort Randolph and Wright are bluffs projecting into the River. At Fort Randolph there are some heavy guns.

I know no other points at present that I could give that would be of importance ; but I would say this, in the valley of the Mississippi we hold 2 Important points Cairo and Birds Point ; Columbus City should be in our hands, but I look upon the occupation of Memphis, at an early day as one of the most important movements that could be made, and one that would do much to quell the turbulent spirits of the South West

Very Respectfully

Your obt Servt

T D WINTER

There may be other points coming up in my mind which I cannot now think of and which should I deem it of sufficient importance I will communicate to you.

T D W

V. E. F. DRAKE TO CHASE.

Hon. S. P. Chase,
My Dear Sir:

Louisville Ky. 29. Aug. 1861.

I have been spending a day or two here, with ample opportunity to note the condition of things. The peace of Kentucky is in great peril, and everything indicates an outbreak. It is not improbable that the Legislature will be broken up. I have just seen Mr. Wolfe, one of the staunchest union members, and he evidently feels much anxiety on the subject. A Secession barbecue will be held near Frankfort on the day the Legislature meets, at which the old state guard (secesh) will be present armed. The Union men are conscious of inability for want of arms and organization to defend themselves, and are inquiring anxiously how many men are in Ohio and Ind^a within reach. I do not think you, in Washington are really aware of the extent of the danger in this quarter. If the late vote of Ky is relied on, as an indication of the strength of the union party it will deceive you. The vote showed a large majority, but when carefully considered it will be found that nearly all the old men are Unionists at heart and in action while their sons, living in their fathers' houses are heading rebellion. There is another large class, who sympathize with the rebels, yet from policy vote and talk Union, and almost *every* union man considers the *South* aggrieved, and expects an end of the war only by agreeing to any demand by way of guarantee which the South may demand. If Jef. Davis' government would to day proffer a suspension of hostilities on any terms (even terms impossible for us to accept) and we should reject them, Kentucky would be a unit against us. I am sure that Kentucky is only a Union State for fear of the consequences of being the seat of war as a border Confederate State. The recent army reverses, have done much to weaken us both here and in Ohio. The people cannot understand why we fight everywhere with an inferior, opposed to a superior force. The Government is considered to blame for this. Another matter—the impunity of rebellion surprises us. The country swarms with traitors. They are daily taken in the very act—and yet none are punished. The arm of Government seems alike powerless to punish enemies or protect friends. Even the public proclamation to punish pirates is not carried out. If the Government would promptly punish all active treason, even by a bold stretch of power, it would give us great strength. When arms are shipped to Lexington from Cin[cinna]ti, let men be at hand to arrest all who resist and resistance would soon cease. In the recent case when a Cynthiana mob turned back the Govt. arms nothing has been done to punish the traitors. Next time they will *take* the arms, growing bold by the apparent weakness of Government. Let the experiment be made of punishing treason and our true friends will rally around the President, while now they stand coldly doubting what to do. Here in Louisville the Hotels are filled with men from the South, actively concocting trouble, and smuggling supplies South. A Supt of a leading R. R. in Mississippi has been here three weeks, planning

to get 40 bbls. grease, South, to lubricate the car wheels, and a few days since he shipped from N. Albany what he desired—for *St. Louis*!! He had the cargo *attached* and put ashore at Paducah—and to-day he has it in use on his road. This statement is a fact. The rebels below are suffering for many things. Coffee at Memphis is 45^{cts} per lb. Salt is very scarce. Tin, lead, powder almost exhausted. Leather out of market. Money they have none, and if the business through Louisville could be reduced to non-intercourse with the South, and all trade cut off, more could be expected than the march of a large army could accomplish. In closing, I beg again to urge upon your attention the precarious condition of things here. A force should be near at hand for any emergency. The only apology I have to make for intruding on your time to read this, is my desire that you shall be informed of what is passing here. You will of course put your own estimate upon its value.

With great Respect Yours, E. F. DRAKE

VI. R. MCMURDY TO CHASE.

Frankfort, Ky.,
June 14, 1861.

My Dear Sir:

I have just returned from a tour, through Ohio, New York and New England and portions of Kentucky, designed to place the people of these sections more in direct sympathy with each other and communicate the feelings and sentiments of the North to their brethren of K-y, and, in K-y I have been visiting quietly several nominating conventions for Congress, to secure if possible the nomination of the most ultra-Union men for Congress, so that Mr. Lincoln may have the fullest moral support from Ky. Wadsworth of the Maysville District, Menzies of the Covington District, Mallory of the Louisville District and, indeed, the nominees of all the districts are taking bold and decided ground to vote supplies and to sustain the Union unconditionally, except Crittenden and one other nominee. This district (Crittenden's) is the most tainted with Secession, except that adjoining Tennessee. Mr. Crittenden is using, in his speeches, what he conceives to be the best policy for him to carry the district, but some of us think it a mistake. They who are helping to canvass the district take bold and decided positions, and the Union men of this district can not be excelled, in the fulness of their position and the heartiness of their zeal. Mr. Crittenden in private conversation goes full length and will do right. The addresses of the Border Conference held here do not come up, by any means, to the measure of public sentiment. The Union men care nothing for them and are continually preparing to fight and not argue this case farther, with the Secessionists. Moorehead does no mischief here by his position, for his private intercourse shows that he is a Union man and the people know that his possessions in Mississippi are threatened with confiscation, unless he appeases the demon of Secession.

If not before the 20th June certainly after the Embargo at Louisville sh^d be perfected. I know it is claimed by the Union men, that the high prices paid for transportation and produce, are draining the South and thus more embarrassing the enemy. While it is true that something is effected in this way, much more embarrassment and annoyance w^d be effected by a perfect embargo—much more money would find its way, by circuitous land routes for provisions, at greater expense for provisions. The South must have bacon, during the summer or die of the summer diseases. There is a great scarcity and great complaint among the people of New Orleans. A leading merchant of New Orleans just from there, at my house, informs me that butter is now \$1 per lb, flour \$20 per bbl. and ice high and scarce. He anticipates, by 6 mos., if the blockade and embargo are not modified, a food insurrection of the poorer classes of New Orleans.

I see by telegrams, that Brazil is being tampered with by the Secessionists. You will recollect that I advised you 6 mos. ago that I knew that this was done and I know that the process is still going on. No country is more important to us than Brazil in many respects, and from my residence there and close study for years of her interest and policy there is no country, under intelligent and judicious management, w^d more readily be in union with us. Now Brazil is allied to and in sympathy with England. I have earnestly desired that the right men sh^d have been sent to Brazil, for the sake of our own country, for her own sake, and for humanity's sake. I feel that I advised you in time, when propositions were made to myself to be one of 3 agents to operate on that country. No country is feared so much as a competitor in cotton, by the South as Brazil. I rejoice that the Portuguese minister has been exposed in time, if guilty of treason.

As I wrote before the arms and companies of the State are gradually falling into the hands of the Union men. The Banks of the State generally refuse to loan money to the Commission appointed by the legislature and money can not be obtained elsewhere. The Governor is controlled by the 4 Union men on the Commission. Buckner is almost forced to resign his position as Brigadier Genl. of the State Guard. it must come however—and then by election the next officer is Col. Crittenden, a Union man. The Secessionists feel utterly defeated, but are looking for something to turn up. They are canvassing now under the banner of armed neutrality. Breckinridge is broken, demoralized, drunken half the time and is failing continually to meet his appointments. His power is waning rapidly with his own partisans even.

The best measure for Kentucky is for the Virginia Federal forces to proclaim that runaway slaves are becoming so numerous that they can not notice them in any way, either to return them or to protect them, unless the property of Union men, and that the Secessionists hereafter must take care of their own property or it will be an entire loss. It occurs to me that slaves being worth more in Virginia than land that the masters w^d colonize, sell, and place for sale all their slaves in the Cotton

States under such regimen and thus Virginia be rapidly made a free state without trouble or discussion, or the springing up of subsequent political issues to disturb the administration, on this subject. It w^d have a great effect to remove them at once from Ky and Missouri. Let it be understood quietly among the slaves of the traitors that they can run where they may, it w^d settle the business. Butler has done well to start with. He can do better.

I am just informed by a traitor from Arkansas, on his way to Richmond, in arms that he himself personally knows of two companies of Indians being at Harper's Ferry, and that he himself came along with Flounoy and several companies of Cherokee Indians. There is no doubt of this at all. I thus speak positively for it has been doubted by some Northern presses.

I do trust that the present Congress will not adjourn in July, until Judge Munroe, our Federal District Judge is removed. Almost every one w^d hail it with delight. Judge Catron, a true Union man, w^d appear before any committee on the subject—and when it was proposed to arraign before him a man for treason, in advance he proclaimed what he w^d do to protect the traitor. His family is the nucleus of Secession here and his son, Secretary of State, is editor of the famous Lexington Secession paper. The present judicial arrangements for Ky. c^d be, by statute, I suppose annulled, the courts abolished and Judge Munroe w^d cease to be a judge thereby. Is there not precedent for this? and then there c^d be two districts made in Kentucky and two Union men appointed. We must have a court, where treason will not be encouraged. Traitors w^d feel less secure.

If in any way I can do more than I am doing for the Gov^t advise me. The Dioceses of the Seceded States meet July 3 at Montgomery, Al. If you wish secret service for the Gov^t in that direction I sh^d not hesitate to venture, knowing that this w^d afford sufficient excuse, but in any manner command me, for I feel that, in any future, no such opportunity to do good for the entire world may never occur again.

Yours Truly,

R. McMURDY.

VII. GARNETT DAVIS TO CHASE.

Frankfort, 3 Sept. 1861.

Hon. S. P. Chase

Dear sir:

The proclamation of Gen. Fremont reached here yesterday, and is most inopportune for the Union party. I reached here Sunday morning. We had for some days before been with the leading members of the legislature and other prominent union men of the state, arranging our movements and measures of the session, and had about completed them when the proclamation fell amongst us with pretty much the effect of a bomb shell. The slavery feature of the proclamation is greatly ob-

jected to by our friends, and has greatly disconcerted, and I fear has scattered us. We should have passed all our measures but for it, now I have serious doubts if we pass any of them. There is a very general, almost universal feeling, in the state against this war being or becoming a war against slavery. The position of the secessionists in this state has been all the time that it is, and this proclamation gives them the means of further and greatly pushing that deception. I do not care about it myself except as it may be used to pervert public opinion and disturb the counsels of union. It has caused me despondency for the first time for Ky. I wish it had not been made until this legislature had done its business and adjourned.

I know that the general principle of the martial law is that rebels forfeit all their estate and property, but many able men believe that this principle is so far modified by the constitution as to have no effect for a longer time than the life of the rebel. The martial law forfeits as well the life of all rebels, but it is not possible to execute this principle in all and every case. To a large extent not only policy, but necessity requires the application of the rule to be omitted. Would not the same considerations of policy at least require a relaxation of the forfeiture as to slaves?

You will pardon me for a single suggestion. Thousands and tens of thousands had no knowledge, not even suspicion, that they would incur a forfeiture of their property by arraying themselves against the government. Ought not the administration to issue a proclamation setting forth these principles and consequences, and give all people opportunity to return to their duty and save themselves.

Your obedient servant,
GARNETT DAVIS.

NOTE

New Haven, October 4, 1898.

To the Editor of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW :

Dear Sir :

While looking for something else, I to-day discovered, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. XXIII, p. 6, (1753) Sir Isaac Newton's "Table of the Assays, Weights, and Values, of Foreign Silver and Gold Coins, Made at the Mint" (1703), to which I referred in the foot-note on page 607 of your last volume. I doubt not that persons interested in the subject will be glad to have a reference to the original document, which, as I there stated, I had never been able to find or obtain.

Yours very truly,
W. G. SUMNER.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution. An Historical Treatise in which is drawn out, by the Light of the most recent Researches, the gradual Development of the English Constitutional System, and the Growth out of that System of the Federal Republic of the United States. By HANNIS TAYLOR, LL.D., late Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain. In two parts. Part II. The After-growth of the Constitution. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xliv, 645.)

THIS is an imposing work published in excellent fashion, printed with clear type on good paper, with wide margins, having a marginal analysis and copious foot-notes, an analytical table of contents filling forty-two pages and an index of forty-nine pages for both volumes. A few typographical errors are noticed: on p. 156, 1551 for 1552; p. 178, estate for state; p. 191, toun for tourn; p. 449, n. 4, masked for unasked.

After a brief review of the preceding period, this volume takes up the subject at the accession of Henry VIII. and carries it down to the formation of Lord Salisbury's cabinet in 1897. The style is good, many points are admirably stated, and the summaries are well done, as, for example, that of the gradual growth of ministerial responsibility; but the book, in many respects, is disappointing.

In the first place there is no bibliography, an inexcusable lack in a modern work on history, and, although the references in the foot-notes are very numerous, there is no explanation of abbreviations nor any indication of the editions used. Also, in the sources from which the material is taken, both volumes are disappointing. In the first volume the author relies more on Freeman than on Stubbs, though he calls the latter, very rightly, "the master of the constitutional history of the Middle Ages," while the statements of Freeman are being discredited more and more by the later and more critical work of Round and Maitland, to say nothing of Ashley and Seebohm. Even where Stubbs is used, the most scholarly characteristics of his work, his scientific reserve, careful qualifications and conservative judgments, are so entirely obliterated that the impress of truth and accuracy of the original vanishes from the copy. In the second volume, also, we fail to find those references to "the latest researches—English, German, French, and American," which we were promised in the preface to the first volume as well as on the title-page. There are many references to the original sources, more than in the first

volume, but we discover no reference to Prothero's or Gardiner's valuable collections of select documents with their learned prefaces, on the later Tudor and the Stuart periods. References to Gneist are made only to his two works which have been translated into English, while for many parts of this volume his untranslated work is the most valuable. Nor is any reference made to French writers. Although a great deal of attention is given to the Church, no reference is made to Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, to Perry's *English Church History*, or to that ablest contribution which has yet appeared on this subject, Makower's *Constitutional History of the Church of England*.

In general the author refers to the narrative more than to the constitutional historians. Burnet, Macaulay, Gardiner, Green and even Froude and Knight are quoted more than Hallam and May, while the admirable little book by Feilden, a model of conciseness and general accuracy, is not mentioned. The authors who are cited, however, are used very freely and long quotations from books easily accessible succeed each other at frequent intervals.

The work does not really carry out the purpose indicated on the title-page and in the preface to the first volume. Except in the general introduction, where "an effort is made to emphasize the fact that the constitutional histories of England and of the United States constitute a continuous and natural evolution which can only be fully mastered when viewed as one unbroken story," there are only four or five brief allusions to American history, and one of these is misleading. The author on page 342 alludes to the Agreement of the People, 1647, as the "prototype of all constitutions, State and Federal, as they exist to-day in the United States," a distinction probably due rather to the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut of 1639.

The volume is lacking also in that larger view of historical relations which is necessary for the full understanding and adequate presentation of English constitutional history, especially in its later development. In general, foreign relations are hardly noticed; no reference is made even to the American or to the French Revolution in their effect on the English constitution.

The author falls into the quite common error of attributing to Cranmer the idea of submitting the divorce question to the canonists and universities throughout Christendom, in order to influence the Pope or a General Council. Whether this was proposed by Cranmer in 1529, or by an assembly of bishops in 1527, is not as significant as the fact that Cranmer's advice was to get their opinions and then to act upon them by holding a court in England.

In following Froude too closely, also, Dr. Taylor is led into serious chronological and other errors. Thus he places the complaint of the commons against the clergy in the first session of Parliament in 1529, instead of in that of 1532. He also wrongly fixes the date of Anne Boleyn's marriage on the 25th of January, according to Lingard and Froude, instead of on the 14th of November, 1532, where probably it

belongs, and he dates the origination of the divorce idea in 1527, when it really appears in 1526 or perhaps as early as 1525. The whole reform movement under Henry VIII. could be treated more clearly and adequately if some reference were made to foreign affairs and international relations, especially in the decade 1522 to 1532.

In the consideration of Elizabeth's reign nearly two-fifths of the chapter are devoted to ecclesiastical affairs, yet without bringing out their real constitutional importance and larger significance. Also in discussing the subject of poor relief and the important acts of Elizabeth's reign on this subject, the author falls into the common error of imputing to the dissolution of the monasteries, under Henry VIII., the great increase of the poor on account of the failure of this source of relief, a mistake made on pp. 97 and 98, and repeated on p. 188. As a matter of fact the first act of Henry VIII. on poor relief antedated the dissolution of the monasteries, at least of the larger ones, by two or three years, while the increase of the poor was due rather to the agrarian changes and the great agricultural distress and idleness. In reality, the almsgiving of the monasteries tended rather to foster the growth of a class of professional beggars, and as Fuller says: "the Abbeyes did but maintain the poor which they made."

In this same chapter the author repeats the immoderate emphasis which, in the first volume, he laid on the *tungemot*, an institution having at best only a vague and mythical existence, an error which might have been corrected by a more careful study of Gneist and Maitland, and even Stubbs. There is much confusion between *tungemot*, manor, court leet, parish and tithing, which the author acknowledges on pp. 184 and 185, only to leave in a worse tangle of chronological and theoretical misstatements.

The personal element rarely appears in the work, a fact which makes the following sentence, p. 294, all the more unfortunate, showing an unhistorical prejudice hardly in accordance with fact. "In 1634 Prynne, a bigoted Puritan lawyer, had been punished by the Star Chamber for publishing a ponderous and stupid book called *Histriomastix*, in which he denounced with the virulence of that time all innocent human recreations in general and female actors in particular." As a matter of fact the work is directed mainly, if not altogether, against the stage and drama, the corruption of which in the seventeenth century is well known. It is full of learning and research, though undoubtedly it did appear stupid to Charles I. and his court. But the cruel severity of his punishments, which even an English churchman has characterized as "fearful sentences," ought to elicit some sympathy in the breast of an American of the nineteenth century.

The work is unduly drawn out by frequent repetitions, usually in almost the same words. In the consideration of Edward VI. we have nearly ten pages on Edward's accession and regency, six of which are practically a repetition of the precedents of succession and regency in preceding periods already fully described in earlier parts of the

work and having little or no bearing on Edward's case. The reign of Mary, of little direct importance in the development of the constitution, receives eighteen pages, of which less than one is given to a consideration of the constitutional points involved in the Spanish marriage, while on the punishment of heretics the author refers to seven pages in the earlier part and repeats four pages of it. Indeed, as must have appeared already, there is much disproportionate treatment which, together with the repetitions, keeps out important matters. To give one more illustration. A very clear and full exposition of the law of libel is given, from the case of Wilkes down to the present time, but it occupies one-third of the whole space given to the long reign of George III., while at the close of the chapter on George III. and George IV. the author gives less space to the struggle between the crown and the ministry, and the reform of parliamentary representation.

There is too little organic connection between the various parts, most noticeably in the nineteenth century, where we seem to have a dictionary of detail rather than a philosophical presentation of modern conditions. Causes are almost completely ignored, and even the processes by which these conditions are reached are not worked out. No record appears of the agitation by the Radicals in the early part of this century, nor of the effect of economic distress. The various reform bills are noted, but, with the exception of that of 1832, no indication is given of the effect of each on the constitution. The great democratization of 1894 is not brought as the climax of a long development nor given the prominence which belongs to it; indeed a false or confused impression is given when on p. 583, treating of local government, a quotation from Rathbone, "a special student has lately expressed it," is given as true for 1897, when in reality Rathbone wrote in 1885 and the evils he criticised were considerably corrected by the later acts of 1888 and 1894.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

Histoire Générale du IV^e Siècle à nos Jours. Ouvrage publié sous la direction de MM. E. LAVISSE et A. RAMBAUD. Tome IX., Napoléon, 1800-1815. (Paris: Armand Colin et Cie. 1898. Pp. 1011.)

THE ninth volume of this great encyclopedia is in all respects the peer of its predecessors. Our readers know of course that it is a collection of admirable monographs by specialists in the military, literary and diplomatic history of each and all the civilized and semi-civilized lands of the earth. Its unity consists in the epoch treated and in the stitching of the sheets into one great brochure. These monographs differ from each other in style and scientific value. For the most part they realize Droysen's ideal of a history which should be scientific as the natural sciences are and therefore caviare to the profane. The collaborators are twenty-one in number and among them are men like Aulard, Faguet, H. Houssaye, Moireau, Rambaud and Vandal, than whom there are no more

distinguished historiographers in France; we use the word advisedly in its latter sense of official or semi-official historians, because with but a single exception they hold positions under the French government as instructors, curators or members of its academic organization. This fact is apparent in the treatment of all the various topics. Without exception the writers take the French and the republican standpoint; in some cases, as in that of Professor Aulard, the radical position; there is neither royalist nor imperialist polemic, no reactionary suggestion even, within the limits of the tome. There are twenty-seven lists of books, one for each of the sections, and in these there appears to be an absolute impartiality, every shade of opinion being represented. They are carefully revised, contain no trash and are invaluable to the student.

This instalment of the work, like the others, is, as we have said, essentially French in its general plan, being carefully calculated in outline, proportion and perspective for the rising generation of France. The Gallo-centric theory of history is ingrained in all its chapters. Yet it is not obtrusively set forth and for this epoch has more justification than for any other of modern history. The work of Napoleon was all-inclusive in its European contact and influence, the mainsprings of politics, diplomacy and war were for these fifteen years under his control, as far as the Continent is concerned, and in some respects general history turned on him as on a pivot. Yet we might well expect a more extended treatment of his most important adversary than is here given. About thirty-five pages in all are devoted to the specific treatment of British affairs, not many more than are set apart for the doings of the United States. The latter are discussed by Moireau, an authority on our history, the former by Sayous, who though excellent is neither a master nor a specialist.

As might be expected the rupture of the treaty of Amiens is attributed to its violation by Great Britain, but full justice is done to the fact that at best it was only a truce. As to the other great question of Napoleonic policy there is a similar specious impartiality. M. Vast declares that the second camp of Boulogne and all the naval preparations for the invasion of England were not a feint, but were the indications of a settled purpose. For this he adduces no proof, but on the other hand admits that the third coalition was already complete, that England had furnished the funds, that Russia and Austria were ready to crush France; he emphasizes the fact that Napoleon always studied his problems for two solutions, that the famous plan for invading Austria, which paralyzed the contemporary world by its genius and still stands as the classical example of a prodigy in strategic science, was the outcome of a long and minute study, and that, in the words of Ségur, its prevision foresaw the chief events as they actually occurred, their dates and decisive results, as clearly as if a month after the facts the great general and statesman had had to recall them as souvenirs. Surely facts have more value in history than speculations.

The person and character of Napoleon are nowhere in these pages brought into clear light. He moves vaguely and perhaps all the more impressively over nearly all. But the intention throughout is to give

France and the French full credit for what was great and enduring in his work, while the weaknesses and failures of her leader are exhibited as all his own. To one important question, the return from Elba, full justice is done. It is fairly stated that the Emperor of Austria had kidnapped Napoleon's son, that Metternich had delivered his wife into the hands of a court bully, that Castlereagh contemplated his deportation, that Talleyrand was conspiring to put him into an *oubliette* and that hired assassins were on his track; it is admitted that had the income solemnly promised by France been paid, his wife and child been returned to his home, and his life made secure, that had this simple justice been done, possibly Napoleon would have remained in his retreat. But here again the facts are stronger than the hypothesis. Napoleon was treated with indignity and bad faith, he was Napoleon and only forty-five years old. The consequences are well known and the narrative which sketches them in this volume is one of its excellent sections. Incidentally it is curious to note that Grouchy bears the chief blame for Waterloo, just as Desaix has been credited with the victory of Marengo. Soult, Ney and Napoleon's illness have a share in the disaster. Nowhere are the results of the latest research better used than in the brief but sufficient account of the emperor's downfall. There is no jeremiad, moreover, concerning the brutality of Sir Hudson Lowe, so long a favorite stalking-horse of French writers.

These scattered and sparse indications must suffice to explain the reviewer's opinion of this admirable work. It is a specimen of the best that modern France can do with its own history, and that best is very good indeed. But there is only a limited sense in which the history is general and the volume is more valuable to students than to readers; the American public, too, must receive it under the reserves due to the conditions already noted, that it is a semi-official manifesto of the Third Republic.

France. By JOHN EDWARD COURTENAY BODLEY. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Two vols., pp. xviii, 346, vi, 504.)

DE TOCQUEVILLE'S *Ancien Régime*, Daudet's novels and the telegraphic reports of the daily newspapers have hitherto furnished the average cultivated American or Englishman with all his information about French political life. It is true that here and there in the United States one comes across a certain cult of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* such as is hardly ever to be found in England; and a steady reader of that respectable journal would doubtless learn a great deal in the course of time. But so leisurely and fragmentary a method of acquiring knowledge is hardly adequate for the purposes of the political student; and there has long been a real need for some substantial and more or less impartial treatise which should attempt to do for the one great "Republic" of the Old World what Mr. Bryce has done for that of the New.

And Mr. Bodley's two volumes are in many respects excellently well fitted to fill the gap. They are the work of a man who has known how

to use his very unusual opportunities to make the acquaintance of some of the most distinguished Frenchmen of this and the preceding generation ; who has lived in France for seven years in different places and under a wide range of varying conditions ; who has assiduously studied the literature of the subject ; a man of independent judgment, shrewd sense and an eye for character. He gives us, in fact, a great deal of information as to the actual working of French political institutions, both central and local, both administrative and parliamentary ; and, what is much more, he arrives at one great generalization, reiterated again and again, approached from a hundred points of view and confirmed by every new line of thought on which he enters, which, whether we agree with it or not, is of a kind to challenge our consideration.

Mr. Bodley's contention is this, that the two great features of the present French political system, the centralized administration and the parliamentary government, are "fatally incompatible" (I. 33 ; II. 184). The centralized bureaucracy, the work of the great Napoleon for whose constructive genius Mr. Bodley can hardly find terms of praise sufficiently lofty, has been the salvation of France ; is entirely suited to the genius of the French people ; is acquiesced in by all, and ardently believed in by most intelligent Frenchmen ; and there is not the slightest likelihood that it will ever be substantially changed. Those Radicals who made a reputation, under the Third Empire and since, by crying out for decentralization, make no real effort, when they get hold of the reins of government, to modify the system ; and they use the power it gives them without a moment's scruple. On the other hand, the system of parliamentary government, by cabinets commanding, for the moment, a majority in the Chamber of Deputies, has been hopelessly discredited by the rancor it has occasioned, the corrupt practices it has stimulated, the inferior politicians it has nourished, and its almost comic instability. And while the administration is continually hampered by its subordination to ephemeral parliamentary chiefs, Parliament is still more demoralized by its administrative patronage. The only element of self-government, as Americans or English conceive of it, which the masses of the French people cling to is universal suffrage ; but the only employment of it which they can understand is a plebiscitary one. It is in this direction alone, therefore, that we can look for a way out from the present difficulties ; and Mr. Bodley, had he to enroll himself in any of the party classifications which he sets forth in his second volume, would doubtless place himself among "the plebiscitary element" (II. 385). He is not a Bonapartist, but he has Bonapartist views. But how little sanguine he is, we must let him tell us :

"The only hope of an improved state of things lies in the prospect of the voice of the nation delegating its powers to an authoritative hand instead of to parliamentary representatives. But apart from the retrograde character of such a change, which would sadden doctrinaires, no leader capable of touching popular sympathies has shown the faintest sign of existence. When he arises he may be the *bon tyran* of M. Renan's optimist dreams ; but on the other hand there is always the fear of

a shallow military adventurer being disastrously hailed to rescue the land from parliamentary anarchy. Moreover, the most definite prospect of ending the present state of things rests in the vague future which lies beyond the issues of the next European conflict; and war is so dreaded by the French . . . that rather than contemplate its horrors they would submit to an infinitely worse régime than the present, to the defects of which the great mass of the population is absolutely indifferent" (I. 39).

That France suffers from grave political evils there is no denying, and Mr. Bodley makes us realize these evils very distinctly. It is evident, also, that the only safe foundation for generalizations in political science is the thorough study of specific examples. Yet one cannot but regret that Mr. Bodley has not allowed himself from time to time to look outside France at other democratic experiments, and also that he has not paid more attention to what, for want of a better term, we may call the general principles of government. He would have handled his theme more convincingly, and perhaps have more carefully guarded some of his assertions.

Thus: "Ephemeral ministries must succeed one another at brief intervals . . . because France possesses a centralized system of administration" (II. 277); the argument being that the administrative system facilitates the advent of Cæsarism, and that this is so dreaded by parliamentarians that, as soon as any minister has been a few months in power, they begin to cabal against him. But are ministries in Australia particularly stable, where there is no thought of Cæsarism? Again Mr. Bodley points out that the result of the present combination of parliamentary government with bureaucracy is that "each member of Parliament, *not hostile to the government*" (the italics are my own) "becomes a wholesale dispenser of places, controlling the administrative and fiscal services of his constituency, and supervising the promotion of the judges" (I. 33). But this patronage one would expect either to help to keep ministries in office, as it did in England in the eighteenth century, or to assist in consolidating two great rival parties, as it notoriously does in the United States to-day. What needs to be explained is not only why the existence of the French bureaucracy has had certain effects, but also why it has not had others, which *a priori* are just as probable.

Or to take a smaller matter, but still one of great importance. "The causes of the Senate's lack of influence," says Mr. Bodley, "must be looked for within its own composition" (II. 50). Surely it is much truer to say, as Mr. Lowell does, in a book (*Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*) which certainly does not sink in our estimation on comparison with Mr. Bodley's, that "this must necessarily be the condition of one of two chambers whenever the cabinet is responsible to the other; and the cabinet cannot in the long run be responsible to both." The fact is that beneath French nature there is human nature, and beneath the workings of specifically French institutions there are the exigencies of all political life; and Mr. Bodley hardly attempts to distinguish between the two categories.

Mr. Bodley reminds us again and again that the great body of the people are quite contented with the government so far as it touches them, and trouble themselves but little with the faction fights of Paris. He would not perhaps have left upon us so gloomy an impression in the end, if he had given us some further account in detail of that administrative system to which he so often refers in general terms. We should like to know how the ranks of the service are recruited, what are its main branches and their duties, what is the normal career of a young civil servant of ability. We gather that the civil service of France is free from all suspicion of corruption in any of its grosser forms. We gather also that it is filled on the whole with competent men, who do their work with efficiency. If this is so, there is some excuse for the popular apathy about the proceedings of the Chamber; and Mr. Bodley, in concentrating his attention on the parliamentary system, may even be thought to have been paying unconscious homage to an idol of the British market-place. But even the Devil is not quite black; neither the United States nor England, blessed as they are with two great parties, could boast of that "continuity of foreign policy which has been one of the most remarkable phenomena . . . of the Third Republic" (II. 282). Moreover, he may conceivably "take a thought and mend." As against the dogmatic assertions of Mr. Bodley that "the idea of introducing the party system into the French Parliament is a chimerical dream of theorists" (II. 349), and that "there is no more prospect of it than there is of the resurrection of the Merovingian kings" (II. 323), I am inclined to set the observation of Mr. Lowell that, with the acceptance of the Republic by the Right, one at least of the great obstacles to the formation of two great parties is in course of removal (*o. c.*, 105).

Though we may not quite follow Mr. Bodley in his conclusions, his book is extraordinarily interesting. He has something significant to tell us of a score of aspects of French life which have hardly ever attracted the attention of English observers. Let me signalize the pages on the three virtuous bodies still left to France, the Army, the University and the Clergy (I. 53-56); on anticlericalism in the provinces (I. 147-156); on the use of titles in modern France and the mischievous results of governmental inconsistency (I. 179-191, II. 374-380); and on the failure of the school system to promote the sense of social equality (I. 201-203). As to the gulf which has opened between the world of fashion and the intellect of the nation (I. 194-200) we may add to what Mr. Bodley says that the same phenomenon was already observed in the early days of the Second Empire. M. Scherer, dining with Sir M. Grant Duff in 1863, as the latter's diary records, "spoke much of the divorce of intellect and position which is so strange a feature in French society at present." It is hardly worth while criticizing details; but some two or three points may be barely mentioned. Mr. Bodley has quite an exaggerated opinion of the merits of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. That "the civilized world looks to the dome of the Institute for instruction in many a branch of legislative and economic science, in

the principles of colonization and of jurisprudence" (II. 53), will be news to economists generally outside France; and if Mr. Bodley wishes to discover some of the reasons which have deprived his "authorities," including unfortunately even his friend M. Leroy-Beaulieu, of influence, he has but to read the article of M. Gide on French Political Economy a few years ago in the *Political Science Quarterly*. If he will look at Mr. Charles Booth's last volume, he will confess that his phrase about "the hopeless misery of the poor of our English cities" (I. 26) is a little conventional. And if he will look up the history of the Physiocrats he will observe that the bottom lines of Vol. II., page 235, require re-writing.

A word as to the style. There are whole pages in the book that are perfectly clear, and there are paragraphs here and there forcibly expressed. The summing-up of the effects of the French Revolution (I. 257-8) is a fine example, but it is too long for quotation. Mr. Bodley, moreover, has a turn for epigram. "Every Frenchman wishes to incite his neighbor to go to the colonies" (I. 54). "The strength of the . . . Franco-Russian alliance is the ignorance which the two nations have of one another" (I. 61). Things like this he can say prettily. In spite of all this the book is not easy reading. It is not so much that Mr. Bodley has become so French that he occasionally forgets his English; thus neither "inquest" (I. 2), nor "emphasism" (I. 17), nor "nobiliary" (I. 171), nor "incidents inspired" (I. 189), nor "dispensed him of the need" (II. 84), nor "law passed for his intention" (II. 90), belong to his mother tongue. Nor is it so much that the want of practice in writing reveals itself in many a lumbering and awkward sentence. It is chiefly because Mr. Bodley is so full of his subject, so mindful of all the historical coincidences or contrasts that the immediate subject suggests that he is seldom content to tell anything quite simply. He will thrust into the sentence one dependent clause after another, of comment or allusion, until even the interested reader becomes weary of the perpetual strain upon his attention. I feel bound to make these observations in view of the further volume which Mr. Bodley promises us, on the Church and on the Social Question in France, which are sure to be instructive, and, one would fain hope, easier reading.

W. J. ASHLEY.

The Historical Development of Modern Europe from the Congress of Vienna to the Present Time. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Associate Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College. Vol. II., 1850-1897. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. vii, 467.)

UNDER the wide-spreading shelter of this title Professor Andrews completes his review of the political development of France, Italy and the German states. The first volume of this work (noticed in the REVIEW for January, 1897) contained an admirable description of the con-

tention between the new wine of Liberalism and the old bottles of Absolutism into which that wine was poured in Central Europe between 1815 and 1850. That description closed with the self-destructive triumph of the remnants of the old régime in the period from 1848 to 1850. The present volume shows how indestructible were the forces of national sentiment liberated by the French Revolution and imperfectly restrained during the first half of this century. It shows how, since 1850, the ideals of the old régime crumbled into dust, the old bottles burst all asunder, and a new Europe arose dominated by the two European *colossi* of the century, Cavour and Bismarck. These two nation-makers, and that visionary Bonaparte whom each of the others employed as a tool, are the central figures upon the canvas, as painted by Professor Andrews.

The author evinces an excellent and improving power of felicitous generalization. His study of Napoleon in the first volume was a pattern of condensed yet clear narration, and in this volume there is a discriminating and satisfying dissection of Napoleon's nephew. Two chapters are devoted to his administration in France, a system founded upon a legend and wrecked by dishonesty. There is an interesting description of Louis Napoleon's enlightened theories of commerce and of his half-realized dreams of industrial progress; of his tentative, vague foreign policy, marvellously fortunate in the Crimean War and ever after hopelessly blundering; of his subserviency to advisers and favorites, from the shrewd rascals who helped him into power to the fools and bigots who pushed him into his last war; and finally of the dexterity with which Cavour and Bismarck in turn used him.

The third republic gets scant measure in one chapter. Italian history since the death of Cavour is even more hastily sketched. In less than twenty pages even the political history of the Russian mammoth during forty years can be little else than an epitome.

Half of the volume, however, is allotted to the political history of the states of Germany and of the Balkan peninsula during the same period. The chapters on the rise of Prussia and the unity of Germany present a concise and accurate exposition of Bismarck's aims and achievements, and, incidentally, a lucid explanation of the whole Schleswig-Holstein question, that crux of mid-century politics. The final chapter on the German Empire is devoted mainly to Bismarck, the *Culturkampf* and the social-democrats, although the author attempts a rapid survey of the deeds of William, the war-lord, bringing the narrative, as in other concluding chapters, down to the year 1897.

Two chapters are assigned to the tortuous course of Austrian politics since 1850, and to the triumphs of the Magyar. The inquisitive reader, who may demand consistency even in names, may wonder why Austria-Hungary is correctly called in the title of one chapter "The Dual Monarchy," and in the other "The Austro-Hungarian Empire."

It is unfortunate that the treatment of the Eastern Question could not be less inadequate and desultory. Even for a rapid review there are too many gaps in the story. The religious and racial issues involved in the

Eastern Question are, from the necessities of space probably, but lightly touched upon, while at the end of the chapter the author barely finds room to mention the "silent commercial war" which England has now for some years been sustaining against the jealous and hostile Continental powers, and which has hampered her action in Armenia and Crete.

Neither does he more than allude to the new "far-Eastern question," into which the old one is now merging, although there is no more attractive chapter in the historical development of Europe than the one which treats of the Europeanization of Asia and Africa.

No such chapter, however, could be written without a consideration of the greatest miracle of political force that this century has seen, viz. : the establishment of the English Empire in India, and without a consideration also of the effect of this marvellous expansion of English power upon the relations of England and Russia. But our author has resolutely excluded England, as a major subject, from his pages, a fact which, in view of his title, inevitably suggests the proverbial mutilation of Hamlet.

Throughout these two volumes Professor Andrews has in view the general reader rather than the specialist scholar. There is no parade of citations nor exploitation of original documents. The author's aim is to tell the story of Central European politics during this century simply, clearly and forcefully. This ambition is realized. He who runs may read. It is such a book for the English reader of history as Professor Ernest Lavisse writes for the French public. It is a succession of skilful summaries, first, of the duel between Liberalism and the age of Metternich ; second, of the transformation of the map of Central Europe by the power of the sentiment of race-unity and by the genius of statesmen ; third, of the most salient events in Central European politics since 1870.

Professor Andrews ignores all temptations to turn aside for the discussion of episodes and details, or, usually, even for the analysis of individual character. Preferring to reveal a statesman's quality by his work, he allows himself but little freedom in personal portraiture. Possibly the only exceptions are Cavour and Louis Napoleon, who are so well drawn that the author's self-denial in other instances may well cause regret. In passing, it may be worth while to question why the name of the French diplomatist, Benedetti, appears in every instance as "Bendetti," a form which is surely unsanctioned by usage.

Some will think that the author has been too sparing of the customary aids to historical study. He states in the preface that he has omitted a general bibliography of the works consulted, and then proceeds to fill a page and a half with the names of authors whose works he has used. Either a carefully arranged and comprehensive bibliography should have been inserted (which seems by all means to be preferable), or this heap of abbreviated references should have been omitted altogether. In this second volume there are two maps, although there is nothing in either table of contents or index to denote their presence. One shows Western Europe in the period 1866-1870, and the other illustrates the treaty of San Stefano. It would have been advantageous in a volume treating of

so many territorial changes to increase the quantity of this kind of illustrative material. There is also a genealogical chart to explain the disputed succession in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. Upon the library shelves Professor Andrews's books should be suitable and valuable companions and supplements to A. L. Lowell's erudite discussion upon governments and parties in modern Europe and to Professor Burgess's philosophical treatise upon modern constitutions.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

The Life of Napoleon III. By ARCHIBALD FORBES. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1898. Pp. viii, 355.)

READERS of current magazine literature have doubtless during the last few years noticed frequent articles upon campaign and war subjects by Mr. Archibald Forbes, the well-known journalist and war-correspondent. This activity in times of peace has culminated in a more ambitious work than Mr. Forbes has hitherto attempted—a life of Napoleon III. In default of a preface from which to obtain a statement of the author's purpose in writing the book we are thrown back on the conclusion arrived at after perusal that it was written for the publishing trade with a view to dollars. There are unmistakable traces of "pot-boiling," notably in the first half of the book: long extracts from one to three pages in length, taken from the writings of Louis Blanc, Kinglake, Blanchard Jerrold, and others, show the ease with which copy can be produced; while the stress laid upon the incidents of boyhood and youth, and the space given to the Strassburg and Boulogne incidents and to the military aspects of the reign, show that Mr. Forbes has given special prominence to the dramatic side of his subject. Instances of padding appear more frequently in the first half of the work; later, when the author is dealing with the period of his own experiences, he depends less on others, and at times brings out interesting bits of first-hand information, as when he recounts the story told him in Zululand by the Prince Imperial of certain happenings in the Sedan campaign.

But for the purpose intended—the creation of a readable and popular biography—Mr. Forbes has not done his work badly. The style is clear and simple, rarely journalistic; the various scenes and situations are pleasantly and graphically presented; the intricacies of diplomacy, when touched upon, are made surprisingly easy, and hard problems are almost entirely eliminated; constitutional questions are passed over rapidly, while personal matters and biographical details are given places of prominence, so that with its thirty-seven illustrations the book may easily hold the attention of the reader for the three or four hours required for its perusal. And the publishers have done their work well: for in the presence of such a heavy book as McCarthy's *Life of Gladstone*,—a very good example of what a publisher should be ashamed of,—it is a pleasure to handle this light, attractive and typographically perfect production.

It may be a mooted point whether a writer of popular history ought or ought not to instruct as well as to entertain his readers; but certainly

there can be no doubt that he ought to have regard for historical proportion and historical truth. In neither of these particulars has Mr. Forbes been strikingly successful: he has sacrificed political and diplomatic issues for those purely domestic and military; has devoted 121 pages to the period of Louis Napoleon's life before 1848, and but 27 pages to that from 1848 to 1852; and while allowing 23 pages to the Mexican campaign he disposes of the internal history of France from 1860 to 1866 in eight, an unfair allowance inasmuch as the Emperor, taking no part at all in the actual movements in Mexico, was involved at every point in the political struggles at home. Equally striking are the omissions. Mr. Forbes passes over in silence many notable events in the history of the Second Republic, without a knowledge of which no understanding of the *coup d'état* is possible—the uprising of June 13th, the Roman expedition, the letter to Ney, the elections of 1850. Failure to note these incidents has led Mr. Forbes to make the astounding statement, as unnecessary as it is untrue, that Louis Napoleon's first acts as president “were to suspend universal suffrage, now that it had served his turn; to shackle the press; to suppress associations of all kinds—in a word to crush the expression of public opinion” (pp. 128–129). In his discussion of the period after the Italian war he omits all mention of the expedition to China and the occupation of Syria, has no place for *Les Cinq* and the growth of the constitutional opposition, knows nothing of the war with the ecclesiastical party in France, and, strangest of all, omits all reference to the elections of 1863, which announced to Europe that Paris could no longer be counted on to support the Emperor.

But it is in connection with his discussion of foreign affairs and diplomacy that Mr. Forbes's most serious omissions are to be noted. In the first place he does not so much as mention the uprising of the Poles and Napoleon's effort to bring about an alliance of England, Austria and France in 1863; consequently he is forced to explain Napoleon's refusal to join England in upholding the treaty of 1852 as due to the latter's rejection of the congress proposal, an explanation both inadequate and misleading. He quotes with unnecessary display the proposals made by Rouher and Prince Napoleon in June and August, 1866, regarding an alliance with Prussia, but by omitting all reference to the popular feeling in France, the hostility of the *Corps Législatif*, the wire-pulling of the two parties—Austrian and Prussian—in the government at Paris, and more noteworthy still by saying nothing whatever of the famous Lavelette circular, he manages to leave an impression regarding Napoleon's share in these intrigues that is not true to fact. The Emperor's diplomacy was bad enough at best, but it does seem unfortunate that a reputable writer should so present his material as to make this diplomacy seem much worse than it was. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Forbes has ever read Sybel, much less Rothan's *La Politique Française en 1866*, for he presents a view of Napoleon that was popular twenty years ago and writes of Benedetti with all the animus of a correspondent of the *London Daily News* in 1870.

But especially does Mr. Forbes fall short in his account of the Hohen-

zollern candidature and the causes of the Franco-Prussian war, for so far as new evidence is concerned he might as well have written just after the war what he has written to-day. He shows no familiarity with Sorel's *Histoire Diplomatique de la Guerre Franco-Allemande* or with *Aus dem Leben Königs Karl von Rumänien*, the former of which suggests while the latter proves that Bismarck saw in the Spanish candidature a pretext for war, which he was determined to use at the first opportunity; and this is the more strange in that Sir Charles Dilke made all the facts known to English readers in the first number of *Cosmopolis* several years ago. Though Mr. Forbes quotes Lebrun's memoirs he does not see their importance as disclosing the chief reason why Bismarck wanted war in 1870; that is, to forestall any attempt of France to ally with Austria and Italy and to engage in war with Prussia in 1871.

These points are sufficient to indicate that while Mr. Forbes has written a readable life of Napoleon III. he has not presented an adequate or reliable study of the character of Napoleon's reign, the nature of his diplomacy, or the causes of his downfall.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

The Spanish Revolution, 1868-1875. By EDWARD HENRY STROBEL, late Secretary of the U. S. Legation and Chargé d'Affaires at Madrid. (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company. 1898. Pp. 293.)

THIS interesting little book is modestly described by the author as a sketch of an episode in modern Spanish history. In reality, it is a clear and comprehensive parliamentary history of the six turbulent years which began with the expulsion of Isabella II. and ended with the restoration of Alphonso XII. It deals therefore with the interregnum during which Prim was master, with the well-intentioned attempt of Amadeus, with the several experiments in the founding of a republic, and with the reaction that led through a dictatorship to the recall of the Bourbons.

The book has two principal defects. It fails to give any account either of the causes which influenced the kind of public opinion that prevails in Spain, or of the popular movements that determine in the long run the fate of all political schemes. And it plunges into the middle of events without adequate explanation of existing conditions. It assumes, in both particulars, the same knowledge in the reader as in the author concerning the antecedent history of Spain, and the habits, tastes, temper and political traditions of the Spanish people. These defects are however inherent in the author's plan of publishing separately, and as a detached account of one historical episode, matter which was originally written as part of a larger work.

On the other hand, the book has many merits. Its literary qualities are conspicuous. It is written in a strong and lucid style, which is never dull and becomes at times delightfully epigrammatic. The narrative is compact and continuous, and almost epic in its development. And al-

though there is no direct attempt at portrait-painting, there are some singularly acute estimates of the more conspicuous personages.

The most commanding figure is of course Prim,—the masterful leader of his time, “a Cromwell without convictions,” the one man in all Spain who knew when to keep silent, the one man who might have changed the course of events. Next to Prim, the chief actor is Castelar. His honesty of purpose and his readiness to own himself wrong when he saw where his theories were leading, are fully recognized; and some capital translations of portions of his speeches serve as examples of his prodigiously effective oratory. Of Serrano, there is a striking picture. He is depicted during the last year before the Restoration, face to face with the problems of the Carlist war, and vacillating perpetually,—now warmed by the hope of popularity through a military success, now chilled by the dread that if the war were ended, the army, unemployed, would pronounce for Alphonso.

But the chief value of the book lies in its accounts of the procedure of the Cortes, the mode of forming committees, and the generous opportunities afforded for unlimited and unfailing oratory; and in its clear presentation of Spanish methods in the working of representative government. Not that the author's aim is didactic; but he deals with a period of constant change in which national idiosyncracies found frequent occasions for display, and he has effectively grouped the facts so as to throw a vivid light on the peculiar difficulties that lie in the way of a government of the people and by the people of Spain.

Of these difficulties, the most subtle and persistent is the inability of Spanish politicians to unite in steadfast parties for the purpose of accomplishing well defined and openly avowed objects. In greater or less degree this curious failure to attain the true essential of all parliamentary government is common to non-English-speaking races, although in Spain the lack of coherence and party discipline is perhaps most apparent. During the period from 1868 to 1875, when events were marching swiftly, the shifting of parliamentary groups was incessant. The two dynastic parties—the Carlists and the Alphonsists—having deep roots in the past, were more or less permanent. The other groups, usually four or five in number, had none of the characteristics of healthy growth. They were thrown together with the suddenness and definiteness of the patterns in a kaleidoscope, and the component particles were scattered and rearranged in the same instantaneous and surprising way. Such a scene as that of the famous debate of St. Joseph's night—of which Mr. Hay has given a stirring picture in his *Castilian Days*—when Topete dramatically left the government of Prim in the face of the whole shouting Cortes—is characteristic. Even more picturesque were the events which terminated the presidency of Figueras. Early on a Saturday morning he received a vote of confidence and thanks and was declared to have deserved well of the country; in the afternoon of the same day there was a crisis over a financial measure; and on Wednesday the President had fled to France.

Spanish politicians have also signally failed to comprehend that the

whole structure of representative government necessarily rests on the belief of the people that they are in fact represented. In other words, no form of popular government can long endure unless the dominant part of the community is, on the whole, satisfied with the method of conducting the elections. That such is not the case in Spain, and that the popular distrust in this regard is one of the permanent causes of the instability of its governments, abundantly appears from the work under review. At the first election after the expulsion of Isabella, in January 1869, there was indeed an effort to secure a genuine expression of the public will; but thereafter the temptation to manufacture good majorities in the Cortes became too strong to be resisted. The well-tried method of putting up official candidates backed by unconcealed intimidation, was again applied at every election. "In a genuine parliamentary government," says our author, "it is the function of the people to decide who is to be the government; in Spain, the converse of this is true, and the government decides what is to be the result of the elections." As the result of this inability of minorities to secure just representation, we find as an established weapon of party warfare the *retráimiento*, or withdrawal of a group from the Cortes and abstention of its voters from the polls—which action almost invariably means conspiracy, followed by an appeal to arms.

Another notorious feature of Spanish politics, of which there are no less than three examples in the short period covered by this book, is the part played in every successful revolution by the military forces. The revolt of the fleet under Topete in September, 1868, the *coup d'état* of Pavia in January, 1874, and the final mutiny under Jovellar and Martínez Campos, were the events that really marked the progress of the Revolution. The incident of the abdication of Amadeus was also ultimately brought about by the refusal of the artillery officers to serve under an unpopular general. Pavia was thought to be not quite sane because he did not proclaim himself dictator after his successful *coup d'état*. Of another general, Professor Strobel says that "he has to-day in Spain one distinction almost impossible to find among officers of equal rank and prominence. During a long and brilliant career he has never taken part in any *pronunciamiento* or military insurrection of any kind."

The causes of these peculiarities in the politics of the Spanish nation are no doubt infinitely complex, but it is to be regretted that Professor Strobel, while relating the events above referred to, has made no attempt to throw light on phenomena so singular and so full of warning. His book is, and professes to be, only a fragment. At the same time, it is so good that it is to be hoped the author will be encouraged to carry out his original purpose and give us the larger work which he has had in mind. An authoritative history of Spain in the English language, beginning with the accession of Charles IV.—almost at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, when the extent of the Spanish colonial empire was at its maximum—and tracing the course of events down to the present day, would be of the greatest interest. And as the growth

of the United States has been so intimately connected with the decay of the Spanish empire, such a work would be of peculiar value to American students.

It only remains to be said that the present book is handsomely printed, that it contains some annoying instances of careless proof-reading, that it has an inadequate map of Spain, and—worst of all—that it is unprovided with an index.

G. L. RIVES.

Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America.

By ELEANOR LOUISA LORD. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Extra Volume XVII.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1898. Pp. viii, 154.)

THIS volume contains a somewhat detailed study of one phase of the British commercial system in the eighteenth century, viz., the policy which that government followed for the purpose of procuring from the colonies a supply of naval stores. Attention is mainly directed to the New England colonies, as they were the chief source of supply of that kind. Occasional reference, however, is made to the production of stores in the Carolinas and Pennsylvania, while an account is given of the experiment with the Palatines in New York. The concluding chapter deals summarily with a cognate subject, the rise of manufactures in the plantations. In appendices two price-lists of naval stores, principally tar, pitch, hemp and masts, are given.

In the first part of her dissertation Miss Lord traces the growth of interest among British merchants and officials in the plantations considered as a source of naval supplies. Should she ever make her treatment of this subject more exhaustive, she will find that the writings of Capt. John Smith, those of Strachey, and the manifestoes and relations which proceeded from the London Company contain not a few passages which show that they were alive to the prospective wealth of the colonies in naval stores. Perhaps the earliest references to the resources of New England in this direction are in Smith's *Description of New England* and his *New England's Trials*. Puritanism obscured this feature of colonization in New England and tobacco had a similar effect in Virginia. But as we approach the close of the seventeenth century it comes again into prominence and holds a leading place during the century which follows. Miss Lord's account of the persistent efforts of Sir Matthew Dudley and his associates to procure from the crown a charter incorporating them as a company for the production of naval stores is interesting and important. In that chapter she has fully and satisfactorily explained an episode respecting which a brief reference in a note of Palfrey contained about all the information that was previously accessible. Of the experiments with contract emigrant labor, that with the Palatines in New York had already been pretty fully investigated, and the most important documents respecting it have long been accessible;

but Miss Lord has been able to give a fuller account than any earlier writer of a similar effort to produce naval stores made about 1730 by David Dunbar and others in southern Maine east of the Kennebec River.

In the history of the system, however, the questions of chartered companies and of emigrant labor are of much less importance than the policy of encouragement by bounties and the efforts to preserve the woods, or trees within the woods, which were of size proper to be reserved for the royal navy. The second part of the volume is devoted to this subject. The origin and results of the act of Parliament of 1705, by which the bounty system was inaugurated, are explained. Under this act John Bridger was appointed surveyor-general of the woods. One of the most valuable features of this book is the account which the writer has been able to give of this office, of those who held it and their work, and of the commission of 1697 out of which it grew. Upon this subject only very fragmentary information has hitherto been available, though it constitutes one of the most interesting and suggestive chapters in the history of British colonial administration. In Miss Lord's narrative one can see the elements of difficulty which were of necessity involved in the problem of maintaining imperial control over the plantations—the indifference or opposition of the colonists; the faults of the administrative officers; the frequent failure of the home government to adequately support their efforts; the obstacles arising from distance, lack of means of communication, and the economic weakness and social disorder which are a necessary accompaniment of frontier life. Miss Lord has taken the system as it was and, so far as her subject demanded, has sought to show how it worked. This is the only scientific course, the only method which will lead to positive results. Her conclusions are that the application of the bounty system to tar and the allied products was fairly successful; that its application to hemp was a failure; that its application to masts and timber, combined as it was with the reservation of mast trees, led to a long and irritating struggle with the colonists which largely defeated the object of the act and contributed to their alienation from the mother country.

For the material of this monograph the author has gone to the original documents in the British Public Record Office. Her references are almost exclusively to these, and she has apparently examined everything bearing on the subject which is to be found in the New England Papers. This is the only proper course to follow, and through it alone will it ever be possible to learn what the nature of the old British colonial system was and how it worked. Other American students should follow her example, selecting special topics, the treatment of which they can make approximately exhaustive.

Among the papers relating to the administrations of Bellomont and Hunter in the *New York Colonial Documents* there is much correspondence relating to Bridger's career in the colonies and to the Palatines. Miss Lord would have conferred a favor on American students who may never be able to visit the Record Office, if she had introduced somewhat detailed references to these. If by references to *Calendar of State Papers*,

Vol. 119 (pp. 2, 3 and 4) a manuscript copy of the *Calendar* is meant, it would have been better to have referred to the printed volume relating to America and the West Indies, 1675-1676, with Addenda, in which these entries appear. According to the printed *Calendar* the letter of Emanuel Downing, to which reference is made on p. 2, was written December 12, 1633, and the arrival of the first ship with masts from New England was reported by him, not two years thereafter, but on the 23d of the following August. It would seem that either the expression "two hundred miles," on p. 11, is a misprint, or that an exclamation point should have been placed after it. It does not seem to me that, as stated, the opinion of the solicitor-general, referred to on p. 111, lacks clearness, for he properly distinguishes between the right of towns to trees which stood on land granted to them prior to 1691 and their right to them when on land bestowed after the charter of that year with its restrictive clause had been issued.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution, with other Essays and Addresses, Historical and Literary. By MELLE CHAMBERLAIN, LL.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. vi, 476.)

PROFESSOR SEELEY, in 1871, by his *Roman Imperialism and other Lectures and Essays*, set a new fashion for men who have been in the habit of writing an occasional article or giving an occasional address. It has been not one of the least of his services to the literary world. It has led many a man, who would otherwise have left nothing with any character of permanence behind him, to group together in a single volume, without much regard to their coherence, ten or twelve detached contributions of real value to the cause of letters, which he may have made in a course of years, and which would otherwise be hopelessly buried in the transactions of learned societies, or the unsorted heaps of unbound magazines that crowd our library cupboards. Judge Chamberlain has done this, and if his paper written for the *Dartmouth College Monthly*, on "Landscape in Life and in Poetry," has no particular relation to "John Adams," it comes quite as close to him as in Seeley's volume the essay on "English in Schools" did to "Roman Imperialism."

Perhaps the most noteworthy part of the book under review lies in the positions which it advances as to the real key to American institutions. Judge Chamberlain does not look in dark chambers or medieval castles for it. American history is dealt with from the American standpoint. It is treated as a thing complete in itself, and having its real beginnings no farther back than the foundation of the first colonies. The author quotes Goldwin Smith's saying that the American Revolution was a misfortune to Americans because it cut them off from their history, but he does not accept it. Their history (p. 147) is to him their own history; and that of England before, let us say, the Elizabethan age throws little

more light upon it than that of France or of Rome. The only story to be told is one as to the development of thirteen states out of thirteen land companies (p. 150).

These views attracted the attention which their freshness so boldly challenged when the author first presented them to the American Historical Association at its Boston meeting in 1887. He advanced them as theses to be considered, rather than as results which he was absolutely committed to defend. The course of historical study in the years that have since passed cannot be said to have weakened their force. There has been no lack of minute investigation of obscure events and rude records of long past ages, but it has achieved little more than to make darkness visible. It is, as he says (p. 169), good work to which to put the graduate student in our universities, for it is the kind of research of which he is best capable. But after it has earned him his doctor's degree, its place is generally in the waste-basket. The deep and controlling influences that have shaped American life belong to modern times, and the important documents to be examined, before the first Virginia charter, are few and not difficult to comprehend from their own terms.

Judge Chamberlain brought from the bench a spirit of candid and impartial examination into the causes of things which gives weight to his opinions, and they are expressed in a style as clear as it is forcible. His strong native powers were quickened for just such work by the wide acquaintance with general literature which gave him his place at the head of the Boston Library, and there gained new breadth and solidity.

The head of a great library has one special qualification for good literary work. He comes in daily contact with many minds, of the living and the dead. A stream of books is passing before his eyes in a constant and ever-varying succession, at each of which he takes a rapid glance. A competent librarian must have the faculty of quick perception. If he can add to it, as Judge Chamberlain could, that of easy assimilation, the best thoughts and most epigrammatic sentences of one author after another marshal themselves almost insensibly in line with whatever train of thought he may himself be working out, and become part of his intellectual capital. These essays are not overloaded with quotations, but they are full of apt references to wise words of other men, woven in at the right point and in a natural and graceful way.

The references to authorities in the notes are also important, and direct attention to some of the latest publications. The letter, for instance, first published by Boutell in 1896, of Roger Sherman, written to William Samuel Johnson in 1768, and objecting strenuously to the appointment of an American bishop, is cited (p. 21) in the essay on "John Adams, the Statesman of the Revolution," as a new support to the proposition that ecclesiasticism was its cause. In the picture of Adams there is brought into the foreground that quality of imagination and prophetic forecast which lends a glow to so much that came from his ready pen. The author justly paints him (p. 72) as stirred from his youth with the "sublime intuition of nationality," and calls attention to the fact that

the Massachusetts Constitution, in drafting which he had so great a share, was the real prototype of that of the United States, and of those now in force in thirty-eight of our states (p. 87).

The essay on the "Authentication of the Declaration of Independence" is one of the first importance, and must be taken as the final word on the question whether any of the signers of the Declaration of Independence signed it on the Fourth of July.

If there is a single thought which stands out particularly in this volume as a challenge to criticism it is that the American became early differentiated from the Englishman by his associative spirit (p. 285). "To the typical Englishman the unit of force was the individual man: to the typical American, it was an organization." Did not our colonial charters plant the associative spirit here? Had we ever a local organization both as minute and as all-pervading as the Saxon tithings and hundreds? Was not the "General Association for King William," in 1696, with the millions of signatures upon its rolls, a genuine product of English character, and was it by his American travels that Cobden learned the need and the good of an "Anti-Corn Law League?"

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, comprising his Letters, Private and Official, his Public Documents and his Speeches. Edited by his grandson, CHARLES R. KING. Volume V., 1807-1816. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xv, 563.)

THE tone of this volume is not less pessimistic than the earlier ones, and to judge from King's correspondents, the condition of the country, which in 1801 they declared desperate, continued to degenerate, until it had passed beyond description, and the strongest adjectives and superlatives ceased to yield any satisfaction to the letter-writers. "In 1807," so one asserts, "neither learning, morals nor wisdom seem any longer to be regarded as subjects of popular esteem and favour," the people blindly showing "wilful, stupid confidence" in the President, lulled in "a sleep which really appears like the sleep of death." The letter-writers make very clear the causes and progress of the final breaking-down of the Federalist party. First and foremost it had become strongly unnational. "Our degraded country" is Gore's characterization; "We are not more virtuous than other states," King asserts, and he asks "Are Republics an inferior and debased species of government?" "The importance of America in the scales of Nations has been very much overrated—and when our national vanity is a little lowered, we shall certainly be a more estimable people," is John Trumbull's view, and he adds that America "must expiate her guilt by suffering;" "What is meant when we are told we must be Americans and support our government?" demands Troup. Yet when it came to intrigue and "dealing," the Federalists for the most part do not seem to have been above the very conduct which

they blame so savagely in democracy. Over and over again, the democratic lust of office is dwelt upon, yet, in the Federalist bargain in 1807 concerning Governor Lewis, Troup advises that "we should be reasonable and moderate in our expectation of offices," though he adds with disgust "that some Federalists have been begging, intriguing, and working with all sorts of tools—for office"! while Gore records of Massachusetts that one reason for the waning of Federalism is that "many of the middle-aged and ardent politicians of our Section of Country have become tired of waiting for place and distinction. They sigh to represent the United States at some foreign court, or to enjoy Power and Influence at home"—a hankering which is all the more distressing and discouraging to the leaders because of the growing conviction they express that the Federalists will never again hold or distribute offices. King himself is forced to wonder "to what good purpose do a few impartial and worthy men toil and weary themselves in the public service?" and why they do not "retire from scenes which they cannot improve, and where they behold more clearly the degradation and the shameless corruption of their Country." Gouverneur Morris, the most discouraged of all this band of out-of-office patriots, asks the "serious question, what chance is there of better rulers if the Union be preserved?"

Such views, of course, entailed much discussion of the remedy; and there are many allusions to the breaking-up of the Union. Gore reports that men in Massachusetts were discussing "a declaration next winter that the Union is dissolved." Gouverneur Morris doubts "if it be possible to preserve the Union," and asks, "Must we wait till the Claws of a human Tiger rake our stinking Bowels to look for a Heart?" But it is to be noted that when it came to more definite action, Cabot asserts that he and others attended the Hartford Convention because "a measure of the Sort was necessary to allay the ferment and prevent a crisis," and his unalterable conviction was "that the worst of evils would be a dissolution of the Union, and all the good which could arise from the Convention would be, in case of the total failure of the powers of the Federal Gov't that a sort of organized body would be in existence, which might attempt to provide for the exigencies of the moment, and that all their endeavors were to avoid doing anything." Failing separation, "a reform of the Constitution is proposed," though King, in suggesting it, acknowledges that "I know our political adversaries will say that we aim at a monarchy; perhaps some of our friends even may suspect our views," and one cannot but wonder how the Federalists could hope of attaining a revision, when they could not gain simple majorities in more than a half-dozen of the states, and when, as they themselves noted, every new state admitted to the Union made the Federal cause the more desperate. In this connection it is particularly interesting to note a conversation between the Secretary of War, Armstrong, and King, in 1814, in which the former practically asserts that the government was not in earnest in endeavoring to recruit an army for the conquest of Canada, because "new views are entertained—pains are taken to impress upon the Western States that

Canada is a fertile and desirable country—if acquired by the U. S. that the surplus population of the east will go to Canada, and not as now, to the Western States—that the consequence would be to check their population and prosperity. This will endure till Canada be filled, hence it will be expedient to defer the conquest of Canada until the Western States are fully populated and their vacant lands taken up and settled ;” that, in brief, Armstrong’s opinion was that “the Virginia Dynasty will never allow to you an opportunity to take Canada.”

There are many side and local issues touched upon, and as a whole the documents are of a peculiarly interesting and valuable nature. It is to be noted that as the work advances, the editorial part is slighted and somewhat heedless. Long series of documents are printed without a single comment, and wide breaks are passed over without any word as to what was occurring. Minor details, too, display carelessness. A note on page 492 should have explained that the “Count Surveilliers” was Joseph Bonaparte. There are a good many typographical slips also, as “War” for Tar (p. 66), 1787 for 1797 (p. 107), “Coon” for Corn Market (p. 145), “possess” for profess (p. 366), and “four or five hundred dollars” for four or five hundred thousand dollars (p. 410).

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War. By Lieut.-Col.

G. F. R. HENDERSON, Major in the York and Lancaster Regiment, Professor of Military Art and History in the Staff College. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. xiv, 550, 641.)

STONEWALL JACKSON was a normal human being, not a mythological creation. He was a soldier of great ability, activity and daring and not an irresponsible, erratic genius. In manner he was deferential, modest and retiring ; in the presence of women diffident to excess ; he never blustered and even on the field of battle was rarely severe except to incompetency and neglect. He judged himself more harshly than any one else did, but toward the weakness of others he had abundant charity. In religion, he was a quiet Christian gentleman, absolutely liberal and non-sectarian ; he was too catholic to be a bigot and had none of “the presumptuous fanaticism of Cromwell.” Like many another great soldier—Wolfe and Sherman for instance—he was at first thought to be “crazy,” but his foes soon found out that he was always sober and in his right mind. Marvellous and eccentric as many of his movements were they were prompted, as Napoleon said of his own, “not by genius but by thought and meditation.” He made war like a warrior of great brain and moral force, not as Blind Tom makes music, guided by whisperings no one hears but himself.

Until now General Jackson has not been fortunate in his biographers. Cooke’s book was interesting in its day, but when it was written the author had little or no access to reports and necessary data. Written in

a hurry, it rather reminds one of those hasty biographies of presidential candidates given to the public in the heat of their campaigns. Dr. Dabney's book has never been a favorite with those who were around and about Jackson in the dust and blood of his campaigns. He came to General Jackson with more training for the pulpit than for the field of battle. In his three months' service on the staff and in the army, he had no such knowledge of Jackson as the beloved and heroic Pendleton, whose untimely death deprived the army of Northern Virginia of the most brilliant staff officer in it and the South of the one man who could have written the life of his chief. Mrs. Jackson's *Life and Letters* is charming—a sweet portrait of their domestic life—the more gratifying that in her book, her good taste and good judgment carried her safely through temptations to talk and tell which have wrecked so many similar memorial reminiscences. But in Col. Henderson's book we have, at last, an elaborate and exhaustive military history and biography of Stonewall Jackson. Our hero is passed in review before a trained, scholarly and prominent English officer, who evidently has no bias in favor of the cause for which Jackson died. The reviewing officer proves to be as impartial as he is intelligent, unless it may be said that at times he is carried away by unrestrained admiration to the verge of excessive enthusiasm.

I took up the book with curiosity and anxiety, I read it with interest increasing with the chapters and I finished it with one regret—that the thousand pages were so few. I could make but one comment—"of Stonewall Jackson's military life the last word has been said."

A review of this comprehensive biography in the compass of a few thousand words is impossible.

The first thing that strikes the reader is the author's analysis of Jackson's personal character and mental equipment as bearing upon his military successes; it is most accurate and satisfactory. He seems to have made a study of the man as well as the soldier. He has truthfully fitted together the apparently disconnected parts of his make-up and has in so doing exhibited an understanding of the complex nature of the individual, such as no American biographer has attained. These portions of his book are worth careful reading by the casuist.

There is nothing in Jackson's campaigns which seems to appeal to Col. Henderson's admiration so much as the strategy of them. The author's training and large acquaintance with military history made Jackson in this regard an interesting study. Jackson was in the Mexican War as a very young man and one cannot doubt that the lesson he learned by the flank movements of the American army at Cerro Gordo and Contreras ripened into the wisdom which executed the flank movements at Second Manassas and Chancellorsville. And it should be noted in this connection that the Capt. R. E. Lee who pointed out and led the way to the two movements in Mexico, developed into the General Lee who approved and directed Jackson's two famous movements. Gen. Grant said "I never manoeuvre." Many other very great generals have done it and Grant himself when occasion required did it and, as our author inti-

mates, did it well. But Grant had always so many troops to handle that he had rather "hammer away" than manoeuvre. Jackson would have resorted to strategy if he had commanded a million men; he couldn't help it.

Col. Henderson does not fail to note that, from the beginning, Jackson took an independent view of things and was not led away by huzzas. He knew that Bull Run was not a victory for the Confederates to be very wild about (for they were outmarched and outgeneralled in the first half of the day) nor such a disgraceful rout on the part of the Federal troops, as their own papers represented it to be. It is rightfully called "a Pyrrhic Victory." One thing is certain, Jackson never was satisfied with results at Bull Run. On the other hand, he said more than once that a defeat there had been better for us, eventually.

Just at this time, fresh from the Spanish War, where newspaper correspondents possessed the earth and tried to control government and armies, it is inconceivable how Jackson could have carried on his campaigns without them; but he did. He said "My brigade is not a brigade of newspaper correspondents." Several generals talked gently on that vein in Cuba and they suffered for it. From a private at Bull Run to the command of a brigade at Appomattox, in the field and on his staff, I never saw but one reporter in Jackson's command, and he lasted about twenty-four hours. This was the secret of his secrecy and of the thunderbolt swiftness of his surprises. Col. Henderson quotes Jackson's speech to his brigade at Manassas, the only speech he ever made. Did not a newspaper man report that? There was not one present. I, then a junior lieutenant of the Second Virginia Regiment, and T. Harris Towner, the orderly sergeant, wrote that speech out from memory within fifteen minutes after its delivery, comparing every word until we thought it absolutely correct. I sent it to the *Richmond Dispatch* with a few comments. It is the only report of that speech ever made and appears in this *Life*, with little change even in the comments, and has appeared time and again.

It is not permitted to follow Jackson's Valley Campaign as pointed out by Col. Henderson with the sword of a soldier and described with the pen of a scholar. It is an art-study in war. I can only skip over it. Like many others I am not able to understand General Jackson's treatment of Garnett because of Kernstown, and cannot agree with Col. Henderson. I was in that fight, in that brigade, a lieutenant commanding the color company of the Second Virginia. I saw seven color-bearers go down in succession and I never believed we could have held that line. A braver man than Garnett never lived. I saw him in Richmond, with streaming eyes, bending over the dead body of our great chief, when it lay in state there. A year later, leading his brigade at Gettysburg in Pickett's famous charge, he fell and died almost within reach of the enemy. I am convinced that in his treatment of Garnett, Jackson erred, as our author admits he was apt to do with those next in rank to him. His relations with Winder, who succeeded Garnett, were not any more pleasant, and Winder was one of the most brilliant officers in the army.

In this connection it may be remarked that Gen. Jackson's relations with his staff were peculiar. He lived with them on intimate terms, was generally cordial and considerate of them and they were devoted to him. He would not have kept any one of them who did not have his entire confidence. Yet with them he was absolutely reticent except when the occasion made it imperative to give them his confidence and then he had no hesitation in doing so. As he did not spare himself, he worked them harder than any general in the army; at times he seemed to think there was no limit to their endurance. Then, too, he evidently thought that the sense of duty faithfully performed was their sufficient reward, for unlike Stuart and Longstreet he took no special interest in their advancement or promotion. This was not because of indifference to them, but as he never sought promotion and only took that which came to him, it never occurred to him that they might be more like the average soldier. In fact his staff was always too small; as a corps commander he scarcely exceeded the allowance of a general of brigade. This made it necessary for all of them to do double duty and at times it unquestionably embarrassed him, as it did in the battles around Richmond and at Second Manassas. If one or two were ill or off duty, as at Second Manassas, the work the others were forced to do was almost beyond their powers; but they never complained. Hunter McGuire was equally willing to serve as aide-de-camp in a fight or as medical director, and Sandy Pendleton, the real adjutant-general, was anything from chief of staff to courier.

There are so many things in the description of the Valley Campaign that one would like to stop and comment on; but the editor of this REVIEW is inexorable. For instance I would like to say why I do not believe the author's explanation of Jackson's risky and terrible march from Conrad's Store to Port Republic is satisfactory; he could have gone by a good road over the mountain to Gordonsville and reached Staunton just as soon and as secretly. I would like to tell Col. Henderson that in following Gen. Taylor he is inaccurate in describing the appearance of Belle Boyd at Front Royal and the information she gave. It was I who called Gen. Jackson's attention to the flight of a woman from town, and he at Gen. Ewell's suggestion sent me to intercept her. I had known Belle Boyd from our childhood and was not much astonished to find her there. She gave me the message for the General clearly and rapidly, and turning back ran off to town, without speaking to any one else. I saw her again in town that day conversing with some Union officers—prisoners. Col. Henderson will find an account of this in her book, although not a very accurate one. I would like also to supplement the author's report of Jackson's night march in Winchester, which he has made so graphic, and to correct some little errors into which he has fallen in regard to Jackson's personal escape at Port Republic on that bright Sunday morning. For instance, the General was not mounted when the surprise came. He was loafing with his staff, watching their horses grazing loose on the field, and religious service had been ordered in camp. My horse was saddled to go to the blacksmith's, and as soon as the General was on his,

I followed him in John Gilpin style. I think I was the last horseman to cross the bridge. Crutchfield and Willis, who had lingered too long abed, were captured in their efforts to follow ; Crutchfield escaped in a few minutes, Willis not until the next day. The rest of the staff were scattered. I was with the General when the by-play between him and the enemy's gun took place at the bridge, as related by Col. Poague, and was amused at it. But there was a discharge of Carroll's gun, before the General would believe. He then sent me for a regiment of infantry. I met Fulkerson's Thirty-seventh Virginia coming, and hurried him on to the attack and the bridge was retaken. Then followed the attack of Frémont and the battle of Cross-Keys. Jackson wanted to "keep Sunday," but couldn't. And then the next day was the battle of Port Republic, when Jackson closed the campaign with a clap of thunder and proved that after all, in war, Providence is more apt to side with big brains than big battalions.

Jackson has been charged by military critics with violating all the rules of war by his reckless movements in this campaign and afterwards at Second Manassas ; no doubt it is true. The same charge was made against Napoleon by Wurmser in the Mantuan campaign. Rules of war are very well, but there are times when a great general sees that they must be disregarded. Jackson knew them all and he knew when to violate them. He never failed when he did ; let that be his apology.

Passing over the rest of this delightful volume, we may take up the second volume and stop to see what the author has to say of Jackson's alleged failure to co-operate on the 26th of June, just after he joined Lee at Richmond. Col. Henderson goes into this matter fully and finds full reason for Jackson's course. It may be added that General Jackson ought not to have been assigned to the extremely hazardous and delicate military duty set before him. He had just arrived from the Valley and did not know the country over which he was to operate, and a most difficult country it was. His army had been marching and fighting since early spring—was worn out—and he was not given time to take his bearings and learn a topography so altogether different from that of the Valley. And here again, his staff was not large enough to do the work he was compelled to require of them. Certainly no one with him on that occasion can recall that he let down for one moment from his unceasing "push-on ;" and if he did not accomplish the impossible, another thing is certain, it abated nothing of General Lee's admiration for him.

Skipping along in the book I would like to stop Col. Henderson and ask if he has not been too liberal in answering the criticism against the General for rushing into the battle of Cedar Mountain, without a more complete formation. It has been said that he opened that fight with the first file of fours marching in column. It seemed to his staff very much that way. He won as usual and that answers criticism generally, but perhaps he might have won with less loss. It would have gone badly with the other man if he had tried that game on Jackson.

We dare not stop even to glance at the brilliant, record-breaking

campaign against Pope, and can only touch upon a few light things about Sharpsburg. Each was a campaign in itself, and how admirably Col. Henderson has fought them. I am glad the author calls the one Sharpsburg and not Antietam. Antietam was a military misnomer; and Mr. John C. Ropes was the first northern writer to find it out.

If Napier thought it was "a very audacious resolution" for Wellington at Fuentes de Onor, with 32,000, to wait and receive the attack of Marmont with 40,000, what would he have thought of Lee at Sharpsburg with 35,000 scattered infantry offering to fight McClellan with more than twice that number?

Just here, there is a question claiming the attention of the present-day historian of Sharpsburg; did General Jackson concur with General Lee in making the fight on the north side of the Potomac? Col. Henderson takes it for granted that he did. I think there can be no doubt of that. I recollect that just as Harper's Ferry surrendered Jackson received a message from Lee—who did not know of the surrender—to take position on the south bank of the Potomac at Shepherdstown and cover his crossing. Pendleton told me that Jackson replied he would join him at Sharpsburg. Equally I do not believe that General Jackson advised retreat across the Potomac at the end of the first day, for he wanted to attack on the second. I never heard of that until I read it in Col. Henderson's book. The author gives Sharpsburg full consideration and we cannot deal with it briefly, for it was not only the bloodiest battle of the war (except perhaps Chickamauga) but on the Confederate side it was the best fought.

When one reflects that Fitz-John Porter saved the Army of the Potomac at Richmond, and that "Baldy" Smith saved it at Antietam, it seems hard fate that, in the end, these two friends of McClellan were dealt with even more harshly than he was; and when the recollection is followed by another, that McClellan himself, the only man in that army who could have put it in shape to make the fight as it did at Sharpsburg, was summarily removed from command and the blunderer at Burnside's Bridge put in his place, language of surprise and disgust becomes bewildered. With a fresh corps of 13,000 men, Burnside should have routed Lee's army before Hill arrived; no words can do more than justice to Hill's great service just in the nick of time. No one who knew the field and the situation well and who was with Lee and Jackson in the stress of that last hour, just before Hill, in his red battle-shirt, threw his irresistible veterans into the breach, can agree with Col. Henderson in the mildness with which he treats Burnside's failure or the mild credit he gives to A. P. Hill. The author has told the full story of Fredericksburg, where Burnside fought and lost. I shall not stop at Chancellorsville where Stonewall Jackson died; it is a theme in itself and Col. Henderson has given to it his best thought and speech. It is interesting to note in passing that to the skill and activity of Fitzhugh Lee—of late, much in the eyes of our people—the author thinks "the victory at Chancellorsville was in great part due."

Col. Henderson's thrilling final chapter on Jackson as "The Soldier and the Man," his comments on the American generals, the two armies, their discipline, or want of it, and their general characteristics, we must leave without comment to the readers.

These two volumes will delight the soul of many an "old Confed.," although here and there the pages will grow dim and misty. The hours of the night will pass away in reading the fascinating pages, and when they are finished they will be laid aside with feelings akin to those of a little squad of old veterans who, found lying about the statue of Jackson at Richmond the morning after it was unveiled, gave as their reason—"We wanted to sleep with the old man just once more."

HY. KYD DOUGLAS.

Ulysses S. Grant, his Life and Character. By HAMLIN GARLAND.
(New York: Doubleday-McClure Co. 1898. Pp. xix, 524.)

THE content and method of Mr. Garland's book may be succinctly expressed by paraphrasing the title: The character of Ulysses S. Grant as revealed in the story of his life. Mr. Garland has not written a military history of Grant nor a political history of the years of his public career, although the latter field is not preoccupied. His book "is not perhaps everything that is understood by the word biography. . . . It is an attempt at characterization." The treatment is not analytical, but purely narrative. One after another the scenes of Grant's life are passed in chronological order before the mind of the reader like objects before a sensitive plate. At the end a reflecting reader will find in his mind a composite picture of Grant's character more or less distinct.

This method need not be expected to commend itself to all. But some things can be said in its justification. Suffice it to say here that an enterprising writer and some enterprising publishers (of *McClure's Magazine*) have favored the public with an interesting and instructive story, though it be but a variation of a familiar theme.

The material for the period of Grant's public life was superabundant and had to be reduced. For the other periods new matter has been sought in newspaper files and by interviewing old acquaintances. Two-fifths of the space is devoted to the period before his capture of Fort Donelson and of national fame; another two-fifths to the period from 1862 to 1869; and the last one hundred pages to the remaining sixteen years of his life.

Sketched in briefest outline this is the man who is revealed to us in Mr. Garland's pages: Though reticent, he was not a dullard and was proficient in mathematics; he had great managing ability of a certain sort; the team he drove was the best kept and could haul the biggest loads of any in the neighborhood; he was a successful regimental quartermaster in the field with Taylor and Scott. He was cool, clear-headed and quick-witted in the emergencies of battle. His persistence was indomitable; defeats were but the occasions for making more adequate preparations. He made progress in military science; for, though he withdrew

from Mississippi in 1862 because his communications had been cut at Holly Springs, a year later he boldly cast loose from Grand Gulf and took position between Vicksburg and Jackson, living on the country. He could discipline a regiment and he could direct to a remote object huge armies scattered over a vast territory. Grant was not disconcerted when Lee matched his movements day after day in Virginia; Thomas in Tennessee and Sherman in Georgia and North Carolina were embraced in the plan of that campaign as truly as the Army of the Potomac. Grant could judge the capacity of a mule-train or a regiment of soldiers, but he was not so good a judge of the character of individuals. He was gentle and without vindictiveness and, loving the whole Union, was considerate of the defenceless South.

He was conspicuously lacking in business ability. He had not political tact and sagacity; distrustful of politicians, he treated his cabinet much as he would his military staff. More democratic than Jefferson, he held that "the will of the people is the law of the land," not discriminating between the voice of the press and the lessons of an election. If he had not been so artless he would have been a demagogue. If Mr. Garland's opinion (p. vi) that "through all the complications" of his career as President, he "pursued a straightforward course" is taken literally, it is but half the truth. He was personally honest; but his administration was not. If it is meant for praise it proves too much. The man who could be honest and still overlook that "weltering chaos of political knaveries and double-dealings" was not a well-rounded character, was not suited to bear the responsibilities of the affairs of state, was not a statesman.

His intemperance is touched off in a few strokes, delicate as bold. It was an appetite which he and his friends contended against and which his enemies exaggerated. But Mr. Garland leaves it to others, if they can and must, to show when and where this weakness led to disastrous public consequences.

The popular reception accorded to Grant after the close of his presidency was as near to an apotheosis as could well be in this age. He was patriotic and sincere and by his military genius had done his country an undying service. For this his countrymen and world honor him, remembering nothing but good of their hero.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Memories of a Rear-Admiral, who has served for more than Half a Century in the Navy of the United States. By S. R. FRANKLIN, Rear-Admiral U. S. Navy (Retired). (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1898. Pp. xv, 398.)

ADMIRAL FRANKLIN in his *Memories of a Rear-Admiral* has given the reading world a very entertaining book. Sprung from a family of colonial and Revolutionary stock, and of note both in civil and military affairs, the admiral entered the navy as a midshipman in 1841, then being in his six-

teenth year. His memories or reminiscences, therefore, cover a period of fifty-seven years—a period which has seen his active participation in two wars, and in which, as a looker-on from the ranks of the retired list, he has also witnessed, with all a seaman's glow of pride, the brilliant achievements of our navy in the recent war with Spain.

At the time of his entrance into the service the routine and methods on board our ships of war were substantially the same as those prevailing in the mother service—the British navy. The descriptions of Marryat and Cooper in their inimitable novels in portrayal of man-of-war life in the early days of the century well answered for both services. The cat and colt still swung with unabated vigor; grog still formed a part of the navy ration; drunkenness was too common a factor on shipboard, and the gait, dress and speech of the enlisted men bespoke with unmistakable vividness the characteristics of the old-time man-of-war's-man, when sailors were sailors, and steam had not yet destroyed their trade and individuality and relegated them from the heroic work of mast and yard to the tamer attendance in fire and engine-room. The glories of the naval victories over the arms of the Barbary Powers of the Mediterranean and of France and England in the first two decades of the century were still fresh in the minds of the people, constituting an incentive to duty and effort that has been a prime characteristic of our naval service ever since.

When, in 1842, after a brief initiatory service as a young midshipman, just caught, on board the old line-of-battleship *North Carolina* at New York, young Franklin was transferred to the frigate *United States* of glorious memory at Norfolk, Va., fitting out for a foreign cruise, he found himself in a new world, stern in its ways, inflexible in its methods, and trying in its influences. The crowded conditions of the quarters, the superior airs of the oldsters, their tricks of hazing and the scramble at table for the scant and limited variety of fare the mess afforded, soon convinced him that Peter Simple and Jack Easy had been no mythical characters, but that their like and kind were living entities on board every British and American man-of-war of that day. Under such conditions, he may at times have regretted the ambition that had been his to seek a naval life, but youth is ever buoyant and hopeful, and as he says, "After many trials and vicissitudes, he and his companions settled down to the regular routine of a man-of-war," and made themselves as comfortable and contented as the cramped and crowded environment and the necessity of putting up with many inconveniences and restrictions would admit.

It has been alleged by a distinguished officer of the service that the only aristocracy ever acknowledged by this government was the grade of midshipman in the navy. That was done in an official document by the Secretary of the Navy many years ago in which the midshipmen were called the "young gentlemen" of the navy. And it will be well within the recollection of Admiral Franklin that when the "officer of the deck," as he is called in our service, and "officer of the watch" in the British service, required the immediate or special attendance of the midshipman on deck, he would call out "young gentlemen of the watch, re-

port to the first lieutenant or captain" this, that or the other thing as the case might be.

The grade of midshipman was instituted in the British service, from which we inherit our laws and methods, in Queen Elizabeth's time. Prior to her day and subsequently, until the sea-element had achieved full force and command, the guns of British fleets were principally manned and fought by soldiers, while sailors and a sailing-master, skilled in seamanship, handled, navigated and managed the royal ships in voyages and action. But the practical English folk, whose dependence was on the wave, noting the defects of such a system, determined to have a service purely of seamen for the defence of the kingdom and for the spreading of its influence upon the high seas. Elizabeth and her advisers eagerly took such a step towards naval development and dominance, and the grade of midshipman was created in furtherance of such end. They, the midshipmen, the youth of good family, were to be taken on board Her Majesty's ships to occupy an apprentice position as it were, between the ship's company and the commissioned officers, for training in seamanship and navigation, in order to fit themselves for ultimate control and command. Their quarters were located between the two classes—hence the term midshipmen. The English, with slight modifications, have clung to this method of education for their naval officers to this day, taking in lads for the purpose from the early age of thirteen as the youngest limit permitted.

For a long time we followed England's example in that direction, but in 1845 the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. George Bancroft, by a straining of the law, established the Naval Academy at Fort Severn, Annapolis, Maryland. At first, the course for the oldsters, after five years' service at sea, was but one academic year, when they were graduated as passed-midshipmen, and regarded as eligible for commissions as lieutenants. In 1851 the system was radically changed, the order of going to sea having been reversed, and the scholastic term at the Academy extended to four years, brief cruises at sea in practice-ships during the summer months making substantially all the practical instruction in seamanship.

The frigate *United States*, the ship to which young Franklin had at first been ordered, made her cruise in the Pacific. During that cruise the war with Mexico occurred, in which Franklin had active participation on the coast of California. His cruise on that account was much prolonged, but he finally reached home in the *Levant* in season to go to the Naval Academy in 1847, from which institution he graduated in 1848.

The then superintendent was Capt. Upshur. Franklin says that he had an "unruly set of devils to manage, for we were no longer boys, most of us being more than twenty-one years of age." The *Memories* record much more in the same strain, by which we may know that the methods at the Academy at that time were crude and its discipline lacking in effectiveness. Since those days, the Academy has become one of the most efficient educational institutions in the country, as the records and achievements of its graduates amply attest.

In 1855 Franklin was promoted to the grade of lieutenant, and in the grade of lieutenant-commander, created during the Civil War, he saw continuous and gallant service under Admiral Farragut. Soon after the close of the war, he was promoted to the grade of commander, and after service in many directions, both ashore and afloat, he finally reached, in the spring of 1885, through the grades of captain and commodore, the then highest grade in the navy, the rank of rear-admiral, when he was given command of the European squadron, with the frigate-built sloop-of-war *Pensacola* as his flagship. After a most delightful cruise in European waters, his age of retirement having arrived, in 1887, he hauled down his flag and returned home.

In 1889 he was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as a delegate to the International Marine Congress, which assembled in Washington during that year. His ability and high standing in the service were recognized by the members of that distinguished body by their making him its president by a unanimous vote.

Without any pretension to high literary style, Admiral Franklin has given us a very graphic and interesting work. The book is replete with incidents and anecdotes of service life, and descriptive of his acquaintance and association with many distinguished men and women in all parts of the world. The volume, as a chronicle of naval life during the past sixty years, is of great historic value, and well worthy of a place in every public and private library in the land.

GEO. E. BELKNAP.

Leading Events of Wisconsin History. The Story of the State. By HENRY E. LEGLER. (Milwaukee: The Sentinel Company. 1898. Pp. viii, 320.)

MR. LEGLER'S Archaean frontispiece recalls those scientists who urged one to whom St. Augustine refers, to tell them what God was doing before he made the world. The answer, *Alta scrutantibus gehennas parabat* (*Confess.*, XI. 12), was a snub which gave them little satisfaction. The picture shows Wisconsin when the Mississippi was still as broad as Lake Michigan and united with it on the south. It might well be displaced by a modern map which readers, ever learning but never coming to knowledge of geography, sadly miss, while they will never look twice at the geological vagary, or even revelation.

Among the topics of the fifty-five chapters are the red men, especially as mound-builders and copper-miners, then the fur-traders, missionaries, fun-lovers and other explorers, the wars of Indians with each other as well as with French, English and Americans, the beginnings of white settlement, its transitions through lead, copper and iron mining, to agriculture and lumber-work onward from Black Hawk's defeat (1832), polyglot and congregated or segregated immigrations from the old world, the romantic era of "a Bourbon among us," social Utopias, booms and tragedies, a nullification tempest in a teapot, the Underground Railroad, and then politics up to date.

These leading events are introduced by sensational headings, spiced with anecdotes, and all in such an engaging style withal that at whatever page we open we are drawn along to the end of a chapter.

Some chapters, however, treat of matters at a great remove from Wisconsin, indeed as far off in space as the Archaean era was in time. Five pages are consecrated to the capture of Jeff Davis because Wisconsin men chased him though they did not catch him, and because he once served in the state as a regular army lieutenant. Cushing's sinking the *Albatross* in North Carolina fills a still larger space. The only excuse for such a claim to far-off laurels is that, though he entered the navy from New York, he was of Wisconsin birth. With equal and rather more reason whatever Napoleon achieved should be included in the history of Corsica. Much space is given to copper and iron mining and the Gogebic boom, which all had and have their local habitations mainly in Michigan.

It is an open secret that Mr. Legler's book was published *in extenso* by the *Milwaukee Sentinel* in its Sunday issues during the first half of 1897. All local history was then seasoned by seasonableness since the Wisconsin year of jubilee (1898) was at hand. Newspaper men—up to everything, down to everything—grasped at every historic "greasy relic" if connected with Wisconsin by any thread however attenuated. The whole series with errors which he who runs can read, and known to no one so well as the author—with all its imperfections, even misprints on its head—its lack-lustre cuts greatly the worse for wear—was bound up as a thesaurus of Leading Events.

A critic's first utterance would be that such a serial sent into this breathing world *after* its time yet scarce half made up, ought in vain to beg pardon for being born again, and revisiting the glimpses of the moon. It strikes him as many links but no chain—a kaleidoscope which, shake it as you will, cannot form a historic picture.

On second thoughts, however, one must be more charitable. The work is the last fruit of much research not merely in the infinite gatherings of the State Historical Society, but in corners hitherto undetected. It embodies local incidents which, if not beneath the dignity of a general history, are too multitudinous to find room in its ample pages, and yet sparkle each with its own glow-worm Röntgen light regarding the age and body of the time. Such a book in a corrected edition, twelve baskets of broken meat gathered up that nothing may be lost, deserves a place in those travelling libraries, the practical inauguration and advancement of which last year by the liberality of Mr. Stout, a Wisconsin citizen, will always be reckoned among the Leading Events in the annals of the state.

Legler has made a good initiative. His illustrations which are a full hundred will indubitably in as many bookless hamlets start questionings in children who cannot yet read at all; older children, and parents as well, will be thus roused to read that they may render answers. Appetite growing by what it feeds on will not be content without something better. *Leading Events* will not obstruct the circulation of Thwaites's

Story of Wisconsin, just now coming out in a new edition. They will double it, and also the popular interest in the county histories which already leave no corner of the land untouched. They will be welcome to many a reader who glanced at them in his daily, which perished before he saw it a second time. They will correct and complete the knowledge he failed to secure at first in the newspaper which was the perfume and suppliance of a minute, and where every something, being blent together, turned to a wild of nothing. In book-form they will be never out of the way and will live in his brain all alone and unmixed with baser matter.

JAMES D. BUTLER.

Introduction to the Study of History (New York, Henry Holt, pp. xxvii, 350) is a translation of the *Introduction aux Études Historiques* of Langlois and Seignobos, which appeared early in the year. The translator is Mr. G. G. Berry, and there is an introduction by Professor F. York Powell. The character of the original work has already been set forth by Professor Haskins in the April number of the REVIEW. Professor Powell has unstinted praise for the work. He knows of no book "wherein the student of history will find such an organized collection of practical and helpful instructions." For teachers it is "one of the most suggestive helps that has yet appeared." He is not always in accord with the authors when they deal with theory, but as regards practical work he finds himself "in almost perfect concurrence with them."

This preface of fifteen pages is something more than an excellent introduction to the book; it has a value of its own. "History," says Professor Powell, "must be worked out in a scientific spirit, as biology and chemistry are worked out." The literary critic is beginning to find that he reads a history at his peril; only the expert can judge of its value or lack of value. "It is not a question of style, but of accuracy, of fulness of observation, and correctness of reasoning, that is before the student." Nevertheless he believes with the authors that a book may be good science and yet be good reading, and that the historian has no right to use a faulty, careless or clogged style.

The work of translation has, upon the whole, been well done. It is faithful to the original, preserving well the spirit and style of the French. The French idioms have been replaced, usually, by good, racy English equivalents; indeed, one is inclined at times to think that some of them are almost too racy. On the other hand, occasionally something of the force and vigor of the original seems unnecessarily lost. But these are exceptions. The English reader may feel confident that he is not losing unduly either of form or thought.

The table of contents is a much better analysis of the contents of the book than that in the original, and an index of names has been added. In its English form the book will undoubtedly find a much wider field of usefulness than is possible for the French original.

Several typographical errors have been noted, but only one or two are at all serious: p. 192 (164) foot, *Traditions* for *Travaux*; p. 275 (238) foot, *Boardeau* for *Bourdeau*; p. 297 (257) foot, *Wedge* for *Wegele*.

E. C. B.

Duruy's histories are generally recognized as master-pieces of concise and vigorous narration, and translations of most of them have for some years been widely used. The newest addition to the list is *A General History of the World* (New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co., pp. xxvii, 744), translated and revised by Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College. Some modifications of the original have been made, chiefly in the way of abridgments of disproportionate material upon France. The chapter upon "The Three Eastern Questions (1832-1848)" has been rewritten by Professor Grosvenor in the light of later events and of modern knowledge. The section upon recent times, Professor Grosvenor's chief share in the work, is a "Summary of Contemporaneous History," continuing the narrative from 1848 to September, 1898, and comprising 166 pages. This "summary" is not by any means so dry as the word might suggest. A few of the chapters, such as that upon the minor states, and upon "The Partition of Africa, Asia and Oceania," are little more than summaries, but most of them are clear and judicious accounts of those events that are of wide or permanent significance. The narrative is spirited, and the writer does not withhold his opinions of men and measures; but his judgments are fair. There is perhaps no better sketch of the history of the half-century accessible in so small a compass. It would seem that the actual grounds upon which France declared war in 1870 ought to be definitely stated; and it would be inferred from the text that the dual control of Egypt by France and England began and ended in 1882. The chapter upon the United States is devoted almost exclusively to foreign relations, and is accordingly a good supplement to the ordinary text-book, which neglects these matters. The space devoted to English history is, throughout the book, very small, (this does not apply to Professor Grosvenor's addition in the same degree), a deficiency that makes it less adapted to American uses than it otherwise would be. This aside, the book is certainly superior in literary and scientific workmanship to most of the text-books of general history that are in use. There are twenty-four maps.

Professor Lloyd's *Citizenship and Salvation or Greek and Jew; a Study in the Philosophy of History* hardly falls within the province of this REVIEW, since it is addressed rather to the philosopher than to the student of history. It belongs in the class of books about history which are of value not from their statement of the facts, nor even from their interpretation of the facts as actual history, for it is quite conceivable that two contrary interpretations of the sort should be of equal value, but from the stimulus which they give to the spiritual and imaginative, or at least to

the speculative apprehension,—books whose outcome is not knowledge, but culture and ideals. The author attempts to trace through history certain ideal principles, seen first in the death of Socrates considered as “the positive event at Athens” and then “in a more abstract or a more spiritual sense, as fulfilled in the subsequent fate of Greece, when Greece was drawn into the Empire of Rome.” Then we are led to see “the closest connection between the death of Socrates and the birth of Christ. . . . In the wonderful logic of history they [appear] to us inseparable. Thus the death of Socrates was the birth of Christ.” And finally “Christ at his death interpreted to itself the activity that Socrates sanctioned. And, as a result of the interpretation, organism began its struggle for liberation from the shackles of mechanism; and this struggle, beginning so long ago and continuing to the present day, has been a repetition in the life of human society of the career of Christ, a repetition of his struggle and a repetition of his death.”

A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, based on Sir William Smith's Larger Dictionary, and incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M. A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. (New York, Henry Holt and Co., pp. vi, 829.) The merits of Smith's larger dictionary are well known and this editor, as rightful heir to the old material, has succeeded fairly well in compressing without suppressing unnecessarily. New articles, in fact, have been added and a number have been re-written. There have been added also two hundred new illustrations, some of the old being, at the same time, omitted. More space might have been gained by avoiding through cross-references the repetition of the same or similar illustrations, *e. g.*, *cf.* Fig. 127 with 697; Fig. 786 with 880. In general the cross-references should have been more complete: *e. g.*, Figs. 845 and 913 are both examples of the peculiar drinking-horns known as *rhyta*. Here we have not, as above, a repetition but a valuable addition; there is, however, no cross-reference to make them available together. And this suggests that a further cross-reference under the article “*Eculeus*,” to one of these figures would have furnished a probable explanation of Cicero's sarcasm in *De Signis*, cap. XX.

Some articles are reduced dangerously near the baldness of the ordinary lexicons. In the case of this word (“*Eculeus*”) indeed, the Latin lexicon gives us the additional meaning here neglected.

The tables of weights, measures, etc., are given in the Appendix without important change. Here the reader will at last, after consulting in vain the articles (*s. v.*), have his minas and drachmas changed into English (not U. S.) currency, and will be freed, perhaps, from the perplexities left in his mind by the articles in Liddell and Scott. The various articles on Greek and Roman law, hitherto scattered through the body of the work, are collected into an appendix at the end. This is a great advantage. The “many scholars who agree with Dr. Dörpfeld” will hardly feel content with the curt dismissal (article “*Theatrum*”) of

that brilliant scholar's arguments for his theory of the Attic theatre. It is to be regretted that brief bibliographies could not have been given after the more important articles, and also the provenance and interpretation of gems, vases, etc., used as illustrations.

A word as to the plan. The real desideratum for the limited purse is, as other editors have felt, a single book giving concise information, with the sources for more, about ancient life and language, men and things. The present strict classification implies the possession of three sets of dictionaries—Biography; Geography; Antiquities. This need is felt by the present editor, as may be inferred by the insertion of new articles like "Palaeography" (much to be commended, by the way, for the transliterating of the examples) and "Alphabetum" (thus partially recognizing the important subject of Epigraphy). These might well be supplemented by scores of articles like "Dialects;" "Indo-European Languages;" "Textual Criticism;" "Pergamene Sculptures" (illustrated and touched upon, p. 594); "Tanagra Figurines" (also illustrated, p. 619, but ignored in the text).

Further criticism might seem like ingratitude for what is actually given. Every educator must be glad to see this material brought within the reach of a largely increased number of readers.

F. G. ALLINSON.

Under the title *Ein Donaueschinger Briefsteller* (Innsbruck, Wagner, pp. xxiii, 75) Dr. Alexander Cartellieri, archivist at Karlsruhe, has brought to light a considerable collection of forms of correspondence preserved in the library of the Prince of Fürstenberg at Donaueschingen. The manuscript dates from the close of the thirteenth century and seems to come from the chancery of the archbishops of Salzburg, but most of the models can be traced back to the famous schools of rhetoric which flourished in and about Orleans in the twelfth century. In general the formulary does not differ widely from other "complete letter-writers" current in the later Middle Ages, but it contains some interesting allusions to French affairs in the early years of Philip Augustus, and its publication will facilitate the study of similar collections—a field in which there is still a great deal of comparing and sifting to be done before the historian can fully utilize the valuable material they contain. Only the more important of the three hundred and four models are published in full, but enough is always given to identify the letters and indicate the nature of their contents. Besides an excellent introduction the editor contributes indexes of proper names and *incipits*, a page of facsimile, and a bibliography of the Orleanese schools of rhetoric.

In this connection it may be noted that in a paper read before the Munich Academy last winter and published in its *Sitzungsberichte* since the appearance of Dr. Cartellieri's monograph, Professor Simonsfeld of Munich has examined two other manuscripts of the same general character and shown that they too consist of an original formulary from Orleans enlarged and adapted to meet the needs of German scribes.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

Mr. J. H. Round has "printed for private circulation only," a little book of 90 pages entitled *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, devoted to criticism of the recent edition of that document by Mr. Hubert Hall for the Rolls Series. He discovers what seems to be an abnormally large number of mistakes, and apparently convicts Mr. Hall of carelessness, confusion of thought, and unwarranted assumption of the truth of certain mere hypotheses. For instance, the editor of the *Red Book* bases a long explanation on what his critic declares is a mere mistaking of *praemissa* for *promissa*; again he confuses the regnal with the fiscal years through the period of two reigns; entries in the index do not correspond to the pages referred to, and statements in the preface are not borne out by the passages given in the text. Of course some of these charges might appear in a different light if Mr. Hall were heard in rebuttal. The final result of Mr. Round's attack on Mr. Freeman and the subsequent wearisome conflict with Mr. Archer and Miss Norgate some years ago was to modify very considerably the importance and value of Mr. Round's first criticisms. Nevertheless after all probable explanations by Mr. Hall shall have been made, and all reminders to Mr. Round of our common human fallibility have been given, it remains true that the editor of the *Red Book of the Exchequer* has not fulfilled his task with the accuracy, the self-restraint, and the finality of criticism which are so much to be desired, and which have adorned so many of the volumes of the Rolls Series. Mr. Round hints that these defects are so great as to require the withdrawal of the whole edition; but this is an absurdly extreme proposition, which is certainly not justified by the imperfections so far pointed out. No edition of any document is entirely free from blemish or question, and this will simply need to be used with extra care by the student, and in the last resort reference will have to be made occasionally to the manuscript itself.

But the propriety of the personalities in which Mr. Round indulges and of the general sarcasm which he adds to his criticism of individual points is quite another question. There seems to us no possible justification for this kind of writing. Material criticism of the text or valid charges against the method of editing might be trusted to speak for themselves without the constant personal application of these by the critic to the author. Readers of a review whose opinions are worth considering will probably be quite able of themselves to make the proper inference as to the ability of the author from the criticisms alone, without the critic's doing this for them. Mr. Round's reviews would be much more scholarly and useful, as well as more magnanimous and more courteous, if he had taken the space which he has devoted to attacks on Mr. Hall personally, and given in it a really complete list of the imperfections of the work under his observation. Such a list would be of real value to students who have occasion to use the *Red Book*, while his petty personalities are a vexation and a weariness to the flesh. Whatever may be the real reason for the necessity under which Mr. Round feels himself of printing his three reviews privately and at his own expense, there would

seem to be considerable justification for the refusal of any editor to print reviews marked by so much personal animus.

The Romance of the House of Savoy, 1003-1519 (Putnam, two vols., pp. 258, 272), is likely to disappoint any historical student who goes to it for history of a solid kind. It does not pretend to give more than an anecdotal or gossip account of the picturesque personages who made the House of Savoy conspicuous in its first centuries. The author, who writes under the name of Alethea Wiel, is already known by a rambling volume on Venice in the "Story of the Nations" series. Her present work belongs to that class of which the late Mrs. Oliphant's *Makers of Florence*, etc., were excellent types; but Mrs. Wiel, at her best, is better than Mrs. Oliphant. Although she indulges rather freely in sentimental reflections, she is not so voluble and redundant nor so regardless of syntax as Mrs. Oliphant was. English readers will find in her beautiful volume many stories familiar enough to the people of Piedmont, but scarcely known here. The various knights and ladies of the early generations of the House of Savoy, who by prowess in war or by marriage with European sovereigns made their lineage famous, are described in detail. Mrs. Wiel excels in such passages as the description of the Green Count's tourney, and the devotion of Empress Bertha, the wife of that Henry IV. who made the journey to Canossa. She has, further, fished out of the older sources a good deal of curious information; for example, the account of the "home surroundings" of the family, taken from fifteenth-century inventories; or the coronation of the duke-pope, Felix V., from the contemporary letter of Æneas Sylvius. Thus, although the book is addressed to the general reader, it has also something for the more exacting expert. The illustrations have a real historical value, except the portraits of the early Savoy princes, which are imaginary. We had noted for mention a few slips of statement, or misprints, but they are not likely to lead a serious reader astray, and need not be here set down.

Dr. Ferdinand Schwill's *History of Modern Europe* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 434) narrates in three hundred and eighty octavo pages the story of Continental Europe and of England from the memorable Hallowe'en of 1517 to the assassination of the Czar Alexander II. (1881). An introduction of twenty-four pages, clearly written and interesting like the rest of the book, furnishes a viaticum for the hurried journey.

The more important genealogical tables and nine good maps are given in an appendix. The bibliographies are very brief, as they should be; they might, however, have been made better even in the same compass. We miss useful and well known books like Miss Putnam's *William the Silent*, De Tocqueville's *France before the Revolution*, H. Morse Stephens's *French Revolution*, Lowell's *Eve of the French Revolution*, the Countess Cesaresco's *Liberation of Italy*, any one of which is likely to prove more to the point than Burton's *History of Scotland* or even Carlyle's *Frederick the Great*.

The choice and treatment of the matter is disappointingly conventional. There is, indeed, a refreshing paragraph on Philip II.—no “Demon of the South” but “a slow plodding burgher, who took his business of kingship very seriously, and who, but for his radical intolerance, would have been as foreign to any kind of enthusiasm as the head of a bank.” In general, however, Dr. Schwill has clung closely to the tradition of narrative political history. His book must be classed with the manuals of Dyer and of Lodge, not with M. Lavissee’s *coup d’œil*, or Professor Adams’s admirable *Growth of the French Nation*. There is the usual assumption made that if we set forth the most striking events clearly and sequentially they will explain themselves. Yet no one could discover the deepest significance of the French Revolution or account even partially for Napoleon’s success from reading Dr. Schwill’s narrative.

J. H. R.

Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace in *The Wonderful Century, its Successes and its Failures* (New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., pp. 400), does not claim to present a history, but rather an appreciation of the century, what it has done and what it has left undone. His intention is “to give short descriptive sketches of those great material and intellectual achievements which especially distinguish the nineteenth century from any and all its predecessors, and to show how fundamental is the change they have effected in our earth and civilization.” The book, though suggestive and interesting as the product of a mind distinguished for its accomplishments in the field of physical science, is yet disappointing to one who looks to it for a well-balanced discussion of its main theme. The first part presents a series of discussions of the inventions and discoveries of the age, but the second portion is an extraordinary exhibition of hobby-riding, in which phrenology, spiritualism, opposition to vaccination, and universal panaceas for poverty play a part so exaggerated that, in spite of the author’s eminence in his own field, it is impossible to take the whole book seriously as an estimate of nineteenth-century civilization. The best passage in the book is the history of the writer’s own co-discovery with Darwin of the principles chiefly associated with the latter’s name. His candor and generosity in recognizing Darwin as the principal discoverer are admirable.

Fustel de Coulanges, par Paul Guiraud, maître des conférences à l’École Normale Supérieure, professeur adjoint à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris (Paris, Hachette, 1896, pp. 272.)—The life of a scholar, pure and simple, does not afford much material for the biographer. Coulanges lived through some very dramatic scenes in French history, and yet scarcely more than the echoes of that outer world ever disturbed the placid atmosphere of the student. He was not unmindful of the stirring events passing in such rapid succession under his windows, and he pondered much upon the new problems which confronted the French people. But he was no such letter-writer as Freeman; he was never in

the habit of passing off hand judgments upon men and measures ; hence, the pages of his biographer can present nothing of the breezy freshness so marked in Stephens's *Life and Letters*. The story of Coulanges' life, therefore, a life singularly uneventful, and of itself soon told, an ideal life for the scholar, affords little more than a chronological setting for a series of reviews of his several works, arranged in the order of appearance and with some allusion to passing events. The book, however, is not without its value. It is the work of a loving and appreciative hand ; yet the obvious and well-known faults of Coulanges are neither ignored nor glossed. The criticisms are fair ; the estimates just. The student will find the book a most serviceable guide in assisting him to form an opinion of the value of Coulanges as an historian and critic. The list of chapter-titles shows the scope of the work : *Les débuts* (1830-1860), *Le séjour à Strasbourg* (1860-1870), *La Cité Antique, Études politiques* (1870-1871), *Sur l'enseignement à l'École Normale Supérieure et à la Sorbonne, L'Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France, Les polémiques de Fustel de Coulanges, Sa méthode historique, Sa philosophie de l'histoire, Études sur les questions sociales, Fustel de Coulanges écrivain, Les dernières années* (1880-1889).

BÉNJAMIN TERRY.

A new edition of Eggleston's *Life of Major-General John Paterson* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. 488) was hardly to be expected within four years after its first publication, but the discovery of over one hundred letters to and from General Paterson has, in the author's opinion, justified a revision of the book. The book has grown from one of 293 pages to one of 488. Much the greater portion of this accession consists of letters and documents, many of them published for the first time ; but extensive additions have also been made to the text. The letters are mainly from the Heath and Knox papers, but much new information respecting the life and services of General Paterson has been gathered from other sources.

The first chapter has been increased, but not to any important extent. Chapters II., III., and IV. (1774-1778), besides receiving accessions of text and documents, have been cut to pieces and the parts re-arranged or re-written. The result is a great improvement both from a chronological and (usually) also from a logical point of view. This is particularly true of the passages that deal with Ticonderoga and Saratoga. Moreover the brief mention, at the appropriate places, of the leading events in the progress of the Revolution brings the facts of General Paterson's service into clearer relation with events elsewhere. In later chapters this has not been done to the same extent.

The greatest amount of new material belongs to the years 1778 to 1783 ; accordingly the chapters (V. and VI.) upon this period have been almost entirely re-written. Indeed Chapter VI. (1780-1783) has become little else than a collection of letters to and from General Paterson, and letters, orders, etc., containing reference to him. Here the

letters are allowed to tell their own story, with little comment from the author. Chapter VII. has also been overhauled and added to; Chapters VIII. and IX. have not been changed.

Much of this documentary material relates only to military routine or details of organization, but some of it has a broader bearing. The correspondence between Generals Paterson and Heath, while the former was in chief or subordinate command at West Point (for example, General Paterson's letter of March 31, 1780, p. 214), is but another witness, if others were needed, of the terrible condition of the army and the country in those dark days.

Among the additions to the text may be noted fuller accounts of the operations on the Hudson, the British plan of campaign and the reasons for its failure, the American plans for defence (notably a history of the great chain and boom at West Point); also an account of the Conway Cabal (it seems strange, however, to hear that as late as May, 1780, "General Greene began openly to assert the incompetency of Washington, and to try to undermine him," p. 216), and a history of the Ohio scheme. Six new illustrations have been added and two appendices, one being the correspondence between Washington and Putnam relative to the Ohio lands. As a result of this new edition the part which General Paterson had in the war will be much better known.

One error in the first edition, repeated in the second, should be noticed. The Bank of England was not founded in 1692 (p. 1), but in 1694. William Paterson's scheme was presented in 1691, but was not acted upon until three years later.

E. C. B.

Dr. Edward Stanwood's *History of Presidential Elections*, which reached its fourth edition in 1896, has been largely re-written and expanded, and now appears under the altered title, *A History of the Presidency* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., pp. 586). The adoption of the more comprehensive title is due to a widening of the scope of the book. The greatest changes have, naturally, been made in the earlier chapters, which were somewhat meagre before. This is the result, partly of the altered plan of the book, and partly of the more extended studies which the author has made upon the earlier elections, since the book was first published in 1884. Not only are the accounts of elections more circumstantial, but we are told more of the conditions that preceded the elections, more of the circumstances that made a man available or unavailable as a candidate, more of the growth of parties and policies. As a conclusion to each of the earlier chapters is given a sketch of the inaugural ceremonies. The book has become not only more readable, but also more valuable, since more light is thrown upon the scene, and the scene is more astir with life and movement. If former opinions have sometimes been modified, opinion has been more freely expressed. The author is by no means so impersonal as he was. Yet one admires the keenness of his insight into causes and results, and the fairness with which the facts are usually set forth. The chapter upon the electoral system has

been expanded to more than treble its former size, the chief feature of the expansion being an instructive consideration of the merits and defects of the system. The chief fault of the system, in the author's view, lies in the fact that the electors are state officers, and the only remedy, national control of elections, is, in the present state of public opinion, impracticable. Yet relying greatly upon plain national tendencies, Dr. Stanwood believes that the electoral system is about as sure to give effect to the national will as any that is likely to be devised; and its evils, he thinks, may be cured, if only there is a real desire to cure them.

A chapter (XIV.) upon "The Convention System" has been inserted. The view is taken that the convention is a natural and necessary outcome of political conditions, of the development of party organizations, and that, as a part of our machinery of election, it has an almost perfect adaptation to the end sought. A brief history of the development of the convention is given, and the prevailing methods of organization and procedure are described. A chapter has, of course, been added upon "The Free Silver Campaign."

E. C. B.

Under the title *Modern American Oratory*, Mr. Ralph C. Ringwalt of Columbia University has united in one volume (New York, Henry Holt, pp. 334) an essay on the theory of oratory (comprising something like a quarter of the book, and presenting many useful suggestions), and seven representative public addresses. These are: Senator Carl Schurz's speech of January 30, 1872, on the bill for removing political disabilities; Judge Jeremiah S. Black's speech before the Supreme Court of the United States in the Milligan case, on the right to trial by jury; Wendell Phillips's eulogy of Daniel O'Connell; Mr. Chauncey Depew's oration on the one-hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of President Washington; the oration on the Leadership of Educated Men which George William Curtis delivered before the alumni of Brown University in June, 1882; Henry W. Grady's speech on The New South; and a sermon of Henry Ward Beecher's. The book, which is intended to serve as a manual for students of oratory, and to furnish both precept and illustrative matter for classes in argumentation and oral discussion, is provided with historical and other notes. The illustrations, however, are all drawn from the work of prominent public speakers in the United States during the last thirty years, an age surely not distinguished for excellence in oratory. It is not certain that students of oratory might not be better employed in the study of speeches that are more truly masterpieces of the first order, but no doubt they will, while they study, be learning something of recent American history.

The last historical publication of the State of New York is *Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins, Governor of New York, 1807-1817, Military*, Vol. I. (pp. 872), edited with an introduction by Mr. Hugh Hastings, State Historian. The principle of selection upon which this volume is made up is neither scientific nor fortunate. The Tompkins

papers, acquired by the State of New York in 1885, include for some reason a considerable number of military papers belonging to earlier administrations. These to the extent of 37 pages are inserted at the beginning of the volume, though they are obviously but a fragment of the military correspondence of earlier governors and mar the unity of the book. On the other hand, the volume is, according to the editor's own statement, far from including what it should include if properly edited. It seems that the papers include fifteen bound volumes and a very large number of individual letters and loose papers. Volumes XI., XII. and XIII. of the collection are devoted exclusively to military subjects. Accordingly the editor, as if in haste to get together as large an amount of "copy" in as short a time as possible, puts into this present printed volume all the papers in these three manuscript volumes and no others, although he states that the remaining twelve volumes have, scattered through them, more or less material of a military character. These he proposes to gather together into a second volume. That is to say, if we understand him rightly, that the second volume will go over again in chronological order the years from 1800 to 1816, presenting papers which by all means ought to be arranged in one chronological series with the present set. The unhappy student will have to be perpetually turning from one volume to the other to compare papers which ought to be placed side by side. This will of course diminish greatly the use of the material. Under these circumstances it is perhaps fortunate that much of it has no use. Every paper found in the manuscript volumes attacked has apparently been printed, however trivial or formal. The editing consists of a historical introduction of most inferior quality abounding in irrelevancy and "state patriotism," and of supplying to each paper a heading. One has usually to turn over to the end of a document in order to find the name of the author or person to whom it is addressed. The editor's good taste and competency may be perceived if one quotes a few of his headings to the papers: p. 325, "The Usual Dispute Over Seniority;" p. 492, "In Spite of the Critical Condition of Affairs Officers Find Time to Quibble Over Rank;" p. 550, "Delightful Discretion Left to Officers in the Matter of Details in Uniform;" p. 556, "Snubbed by the Former Adjutant General;" p. 594, "General John Swift Evidently Years Ahead of His Time;" p. 649, "Questions That Seem Odd to the American of the Present Generation." It is fair to say that the volume of course contains a great deal of valuable material for the history of the participation of New York in the war of 1812.

It is not solely the inquirer into Virginian genealogies who will be interested in *The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish, Virginia, 1720-1789*, which Mr. Churchill Gibson Chamberlayne, of Richmond, has transcribed and privately printed in an edition of five hundred copies. The volume (of 419 pages) contains, indeed, much material for the genealogist—births, baptisms and deaths from April, 1685, to March, 1798. But those, and they are now many, who are interested in the

history of local government in the South will find here a typical series of entries as to the business of a Virginian parish in the last century. The volume contains, with the exception of one year, the minutes of all vestry meetings from October 30, 1720, to April 18, 1789, comprising both votes and accounts, records of elections and processionings, and casting light on all manner of details of local administration—glebes, tithes, church-buildings, burials, roads, bounds, the poor, the taxes. Mr. Chamberlayne has added a full index to the volume.

The *Report on the Canadian Archives* for 1897 by Dr. Douglas Brymner, archivist of the Dominion (pp. 125, 253-396, 81-179) presents a calendar of state papers relating to Lower Canada and extending from 1818 to the end of the year 1823, and one of similar extent for Upper Canada. According to custom, several groups of papers falling within the period named are given at length. These relate to proposals for union between Upper and Lower Canada ; to claims for losses during the war of 1812 ; to projects for the improvement of internal communication ; and to certain disputes relating to the Northwest regions. In another appendix is a good facsimile of the Cabot map of 1544 with a memorandum upon the map by Dr. S. E. Dawson, the Latin and Spanish texts of the legend on the map, and an English translation of both.

NOTES AND NEWS

The author of the first article in the present issue of the REVIEW, M. Henri Hauser, is a *chargé de cours* at the University of Clermont, France.

Dr. William Kingsford died at Ottawa on September 29. Born in 1819, he spent his earlier life in the army, in journalism, and in surveying. His *History of Canada*, of which the first volume appeared in 1887, while the tenth (1836-1841) appeared during the year 1898, was not without evidences of the lack of special historical training in earlier life, yet has deserved much respect for laborious research and other solid excellences.

The American Historical Association holds its annual meeting at New Haven, on December 28, 29 and 30. The president is Professor George Park Fisher of Yale University; Professor E. G. Bourne of the same university is chairman of the committee on the programme.

Professor Charles Foster Kent of Brown University and Professor Frank K. Sanders of Yale are to edit the *Historical Series for Bible Students*, a collection of small volumes intended to serve as popular yet scholarly guides to the study of the history, the literature, and teaching of the Old and New Testaments, and of the contemporary history and literature. The series is to be published by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons. The first two volumes of Professor Kent's *History of the Hebrew People*, which have already appeared, will constitute the first two volumes of the series. Others announced as in preparation are volumes on the history of the Jewish people in the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek periods by Professor Kent; on the Maccabean and Roman periods by Professor J. S. Riggs of Auburn Theological Seminary; on the Egyptians by Professor J. H. Breasted of Chicago University; on the Babylonians and Assyrians by Professor George S. Goodspeed of the same university; on the life of Jesus by Professor Rush Rhees of Newton Theological Seminary; on the Apostolic Age by Professor George T. Purves of Princeton Theological Seminary; and two volumes of outlines for the study of Biblical history and literature by Professor Sanders.

The New England History Teachers' Association met at Boston on October 15. Professor William MacDonald, chairman of a committee on text-books, presented a report on text-books of American history, which has been printed in the *Educational Review* for December. A report on the new Harvard entrance requirements in American history was presented by Mr. R. G. Huling, chairman of another committee. Addresses were delivered on lessons which history has to teach to the American people.

Professor William Cunningham of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose engagement at Harvard College from February to June has been mentioned in these pages, expects during the present year to complete the second part of his *Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

M. E. Revillout has published (Paris, Maisonneuve, pp. 163) the first volume of a treatise on *Les Actions Publiques et Privées en Droit Égyptien*.

The Palestine Exploration Fund has brought out, in a volume of 390 pages, an account by the American archaeologist Dr. Frederic J. Bliss of *Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-1897*, chiefly conducted by him. The book is illustrated by plans and drawings by Mr. Archibald Campbell Dickie. The *Quarterly Statement* of the Fund for October contains a plan of the Lower Pool of Gihon by Baurath Schick, maps of the vicinity of Hebron and Jaffa, and photographs of Petra. Dr. Bliss resumes his work by excavations at Tell es Sâfi, a possible site of ancient Gath.

Dr. T. Witton Davies, professor at the Bangor Baptist College, Wales, has published through Messrs. James Clark and Co. a volume on *Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbors, including an Examination of Biblical References and of the Biblical Terms*.

In the *Jahresbericht* of the Humboldt Gymnasium at Berlin, for Easter 1898, Dr. S. Herrlich has an instructive monograph on *Epidaurus, eine antike Heilstätte*, in which the whole history of that town and its antiquities are surveyed, in the light of the excavations of Kavvadias and Staïs and of original investigations by the author. The cult of Asklepios naturally forms an important part of the subject-matter.

An important monograph in the field of Grecian historical geography, *Aetolia, its Geography, Topography, and Antiquities*, by Mr. William J. Woodhouse, F.R.G.S., abundantly illustrated with maps and reproductions of photographs, has been published by the Clarendon Press.

A translation of Boissier's *Roman Africa* is soon to be brought out by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Under the title *The Romans on the Riviera and the Rhone*, the Macmillan Company publish a historical sketch of the Roman conquest and occupation of Liguria and Narbonensis by W. H. Bullock Hall, F.R.G.S.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Winternitz, *Witchcraft in Ancient India* (New World, September); M. Clerc, *De la Condition des Étrangers domiciliés dans les différentes Cités Grecques* (Revue des Universités du Midi, IV. 2); B. I. Wheeler, *Alexander the Great* (Century, November, December); B. W. Henderson, *The Campaign of the Metaurus*, II. (English Historical Review, October).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

In the *Catholic University Bulletin* for October Professor T. J. Shahan, D.D., has an article, the first of a series, on the Study of Church History.

The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XIX. 1, contains a bibliography of publications in ecclesiastical history which appeared between July 1, 1897, and July 1, 1898.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. Ermoni, *L'Histoire du Baptême, depuis l'Édit de Milan jusqu'au Concile in Trullo* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October); *The History of the Roman Breviary* (*Church Quarterly Review*, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A young Belgian scholar, M. G. des Marez, has made an important contribution both to the history of medieval municipalities and to the social history of Flanders, by a volume entitled *Étude sur la Propriété Foncière dans les Villes du Moyen Age et spécialement en Flandre* (Ghent, the University, pp. 392).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Breysig, *Gottfried von Bouillon vor dem Kreuzzuge* (*Westdeutsche Zeitschrift*, XVII. 2); J. Declareuil, *Les Preuves Judiciaires dans le Droit Franc du V^e au VIII^e Siècle*, I. (*Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, XXII. 2); M. Dieulafoy, *La Château Gaillard et l'Architecture Militaire au XIII^e Siècle* (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XXXVI. 1); J. Hansen, *Inquisition und Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXI. 3).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The British Government has published an additional volume of the *Calendar of the Close Rolls* for Edward III. (1330-1333); Vol IX. (1592-1603) of Mr. Horatio F. Brown's *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*; the thirtieth report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Records for Ireland; Vol. IV. (1694-1702) of the *English Army Lists*; a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the manuscripts of the Duke of Somerset, of the Marquis of Ailesbury, and of the Rev. Sir S. H. G. Puleston, Bart.; and a volume (1540-1541) of the *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*

Professor Charles Gross, of Harvard University, hopes to publish next autumn his long-expected book on the *Sources and Literature of English History*.

A new edition of Bale's *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, edited by Dr. Reginald Lane Poole and Miss Mary Bateson, is announced for issue in the series of *Anecdota Oxoniensia*.

Professor Frederic W. Maitland has published through Messrs. Methuen a volume of six essays (pp. 192) on *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*.

In the Ex Libris Series Messrs. Bell and Company are to issue a volume on the Bayeux tapestry, fully illustrated and furnished with historical notes by Mr. Frank R. Fowke, of the Science and Art Department at South Kensington.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. Cutts has finished a volume entitled *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*. It is illustrated with photographic reproductions of illuminations from various manuscripts dealing with ecclesiastical ceremonies and clerical costumes, and is published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (pp. xvii, 519).

Father A. Hamy, in his *Entrevue de François Premier avec Henry VIII. à Boulogne-sur-Mer en 1532* (Paris, Gougy, pp. 212, cccclviii) makes an important contribution to the history of the Divorce.

The second volume of the *Calendar of the Records of the Inner Temple*, embracing the period from 1603 to 1660, has been issued by that society with an extensive introduction by Mr. Inderwick.

The Scottish History Society has published the first volume of the *Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montreuil and the Brothers De Bel-lièvre, French Ambassadors in England and Scotland, 1645-1648*, reproduced from the archives of the French Foreign Office and edited by Mr. J. G. Fotheringham. The present volume consists chiefly of the letters of Montreuil to Mazarin and casts much light upon the negotiations between the French, the Scots, and Charles I., which resulted in the King's joining the Scottish army.

The ninth volume of Mr. H. B. Wheatley's edition of Pepys is devoted to a minute index; but Mr. Wheatley adds a tenth and supplementary volume of *Pepysiana*, containing chapters of a general nature upon the Pepys family, London and the navy in Pepys's time, his personal characteristics, his will, his cypher, etc.

Mr. Edwin Hodder has edited from journals and papers placed in his hands by Miss Adelaide Gouger *The Founding of South Australia, as recorded in the Journals of Mr. Robert Gouger, First Colonial Secretary*, who co-operated with Wakefield and Torrens in the establishment of the colony.

The autobiography and memoirs of Dr. Charles Merivale, dean of Ely and historian of the Roman Empire, have lately been privately printed at the Oxford University Press. They have been edited by Miss Judith Merivale.

Mr. W. P. Reeves, agent-general for New Zealand, is at work upon a life of the late Sir George Grey, Mr. John Morley upon the authorized biography of Gladstone.

The Scottish Text Society will publish during the year 1899 an edition of the chronicles of Robert Lindsay, of Pitscottie, containing the first accurate text, from the best manuscripts, and additional matter unprinted hitherto, relating to the years from 1565 to 1575. The new edition is to be edited by Mr. Æneas Mackay, Q. C., sheriff of Fife and Kinross.

The Société Jersiaise has begun the publication of the *Actes des États de l'Île de Jersey*, under the editorial care of Mr. J. Messervy. The re-

cords, it should seem, have a certain interest for students of the history of the American colonies. The two volumes now published extend from 1524 to 1605.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Howorth, *The Beginnings of Wessex* (English Historical Review, October); Sir F. Pollock, *English Law before the Norman Conquest* (Law Quarterly Review, July); E. Bishop, *English Medieval Institutes of Cathedral Canons* (Dublin Review, July); R. Aitken, *The Knight Templars in Scotland* (Scottish Review, July); George Savile, *Lord Halifax* (Edinburgh Review, October); J. G. Alger, *The British Colony at Paris* (English Historical Review, October); *Memoirs of Henry Reeve* (Edinburgh Review, October).

FRANCE.

The latest addition to the list of historical journals is one entitled *Souvenirs et Mémoires*, edited by P. Bonnefon and published at Paris by L. Gougy. It is to be devoted, as the name implies, to biographical materials—memoirs, autobiographical pieces, correspondence, etc. The first number, that for July 15, contained memoirs of Madame d'Épinay, letters of Carnot and Berthier, and a narrative by Dumouriez of his mission to Poland.

The French government intends, as a part of its celebration of the year 1900, to issue a history of French printing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by A. Claudin, which will be produced by the Imprimerie Nationale in the most perfect manner and will be supplemented with 1200 plates of reproductions from rare books.

The *Bulletin Historique du Protestantisme Français* for the months from April to July contains a varied assortment of articles commemorating, from one point of view or another, the tercentenary of the Edict of Nantes.

M. F. Masson continues his studies of the Bonapartes by a volume entitled *Napoléon et sa Famille, 1802-1805* (Paris, Ollendorff), full of the same elements of interest as his previous volumes.

Abbe Casteig's *La Défense d'Huningue en 1815 et le Général Barbanègre* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 138), though by an ecclesiastic, is commended as an excellent piece of military history and of research, by which the points most disputed with reference to the celebrated siege have been perhaps finally settled.

In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for June 15, July 1 and 15, M. Ernest Daudet, making use of the papers of the Duc Decazes, prints three important articles on that minister and Louis XVIII.

Le Maréchal Canrobert; Souvenirs d'un Siècle, by Germain Bapst (Vol. I., Paris, Plon, pp. 560) is a memoir of an unusual type. Though in a sense it emanates from the marshal, it was not written by him. It was M. Bapst's practice to visit him almost every afternoon, and in the

evening to write down what the marshal had told him. Canrobert's memory was excellent, and M. Bapst seems to have been a skilful reporter. He arranged in order the notes thus obtained, and showed the results to his subject, who revised them. They were also revised with the aid of original documents. The value of the book is therefore nearly that of autobiography; indeed in some respects its authority is greater.

M. Pierre Lehautcourt's *Siège de Paris* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, two vols., pp. 407, 439) is praised by the *Revue Historique* as the best history of the siege yet published.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Vicomte d'Avenel, *Paysans et Ouvriers depuis Sept Siècles*, III., IV. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 15, July 15); Abbé J. Paquier, *L'Université de Paris et l'Humanisme au Début du XVI^e Siècle*; Jérôme Aléandre (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October); G. Hanotaux, *Richelieu et Marie de Médicis à Blois* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Rapports de Louis XIV. et de Mazarin* (*Revue Historique*, November); A. Mathiez, *Étude Critique sur les Journées des 5 et 6 Octobre 1789*, II. (*Revue Historique*, November); F. A. Aulard, *Bourgeoisie et Démocratie, 1789-1790* (*La Révolution Française*, September 14); A. de Ganniers, *La Campagne de Luckner en Belgique en juin 1792, d'après des Documents originaux inédits* (*Revue Historique*, November); *La Constitution Girondine de 1793* (*Révolution Française*, June); H. von Zeissberg, *Pichegru und Condé in 1795 und 1796* (*Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, phil.-hist. Cl.*, CXXXIX. 6); G. Roloff, *Napoleon und sein Invasionsprojekt gegen England, 1803-1805* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1898, 2); F. Masson, *L'Existence d'une Impératrice; Joséphine aux Tuileries* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, September 1, 15); Henry Housaye, *La Bataille de Waterloo* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, 15).

ITALY.

In the *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, XIV. 2 and XV. 1, Professor Count Carlo Cipolla presents a bibliography of recent works on medieval Italian history.

In M. Paul Sabatier's series, *Collections et Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age*, of which we have heretofore spoken as opening with the *Speculum Perfectionis*, Nos. 2 and 3 are to be the *Actus S. Francisci et Sociorum ejus*, the Latin original of the *Fioretti*, and a critical edition of the *Fioretti* themselves.

Professor Camillo Manfroni has published (Rome, Forzani) a work of high importance in the naval history of Italy, *Storia della Marina Italiana dalla Caduta di Costantinopoli alla Battaglia di Lepanto*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. von Bezold, *Republik und Monarchie in der italienischen Literatur des 15. Jahrhunderts* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXI. 3); A. Reinhart, *Savonarola* (*American Catholic Quarterly*, October).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND.

In the *Neues Archiv*, XXIII. 3, Dr. K. Hampe finishes his report of his investigations in France and Belgium in 1897; in XXIV. 1, Professor Mommsen prints a final report on the *Auctores Antiquissimi*. This number also contains important studies by P. Scheffer-Boichorst on the Regesta of the period of the Hohenstaufen.

The latest publication of the Historical Commission of Baden is Dr. K. Beyerle's edition of *Die Konstanzer Rathslisten* (Heidelberg, Winter), which, over and above the materials which the title implies, contains much that is useful toward the history of medieval German municipalities.

The Thuringian Historical Commission contemplates publishing the matriculations of the University of Jena, a series of municipal law-codes, and the proceedings of the Landtage of the Ernestine states from 1486 to 1547 (those previous to 1485 falling within the scope of the *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniae Regiae*).

The Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck expects to put forth, as its first publication, the first volume of an *Urkundenbuch* of Fulda, edited by Tangl. The chronicles of Hesse and Waldeck, calendars of the state-papers of the landgraves, the proceedings of the Landtag, a dictionary of local names, local cartularies and a historical book of costumes are to follow.

The military movements in Bavaria leading up to the battle of Blenheim are ably studied, from original sources, largely unprinted, in a monograph by Major-General von Landmann, *Die Kriegführung des Kurfürsten Max Emanuel von Baiern in den Jahren 1703 und 1704* (Munich, C. H. Beck).

In the *Programm* (1898) of the Kneiphof Gymnasium at Königsberg Dr. Gottlob Crause discusses, upon the basis of extensive studies in Prussian archives, the administration of Freiherr von Schroetter in East Prussia and his relation to Stein's reforms.

The participation of the Prussian auxiliary corps in the campaign of 1812 against Russia is the subject of detailed and scientific treatment in No. 24 of the monographs of military history published by the historical section of the Prussian General Staff.

A translation of Dändliker's *History of Switzerland* is soon to be issued by the Macmillan Company.

Dr. E. Bloesch has published the first of two volumes in which he proposes to treat the history of the Protestant churches in all the Swiss cantons from 1531 to 1870, *Geschichte der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirchen* (Bern, pp. 500).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

A committee of nine scholars, Dutch and Belgian, including Professor P. J. Blok of Leyden and Professor Paul Fredericq of Ghent, has been formed for the preparation of a comprehensive historical atlas of the old Netherlands.

The association of Dutch archivists having appointed a committee to prepare a plan for securing uniformity in the scientific organization of the various Dutch archives, the committee, Messrs. Feith, Fruin and Muller, have made their report in a considerable volume, submitted to the association for discussion.

Since the Council of Brabant had powers both executive, legislative and judicial, of greater extent than most of the provincial councils, a great importance attaches to the careful work, *Le Conseil de Brabant : Histoire, Organisation, Procédure*, of which the first volume has been published by M. Arthur Gaillard, assistant archivist-general of the kingdom of Belgium. The book (Brussels, Lebègue, pp. 492) rests upon materials in the archives of the Council and in those of the Chamber of Accounts of Brabant.

Professor Paul Fredericq has published a second volume (Ghent, Vuylsteke, pp. 195) of his *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*. This instalment relates to the fourteenth century.

Messrs. Muller and Diegerick have published the fourth volume (January, 1581, to March, 1583) of their *Documents concernant les Relations entre le Duc d'Anjou et les Pays-Bas* (Werken van het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht, n. s., LX.). A fifth volume, extending from March, 1583, to the duke's death, will complete this important series.

Thirty-six of the most prominent Dutch statesmen, historians, artists, and men of science have co-operated in the preparation of a work on the political and social history of the Netherlands during the last half-century, a collection of monographs forming two volumes with the title *Een Halve Eeuw, 1848-1898*.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Of the recent Swedish historical publications the most important are : *Sveriges Ridderskaps och Adels Riksdagsprotokoll*, XIV. (1682-1683) ; E. Hildebrand's *Svenska Statsförfattningens Historiska Utveckling från äldsta Tid till våra Dagar* ; J. Mankell's *Krigshistoria 1592-1611* ; Vol. I. of Wimarson's *Sveriges Krig i Tyskland* (1675-1679) ; C. G. Malmström's *Sveriges Politiska Historia från Konung Karl XII:s Död till Statshväfningen 1772*, Vol. III. ; and Professor C. T. Odhner's *Sveriges Politiska Historia under Konung Gustaf III:s Regering*, Vol. II. (1779-1787).

The Archaeological Society of Moscow has established "an archaeological commission," the function of which is to print reports upon the contents of the lesser public and the private archives of Russia—*anglice*, a Historical Manuscripts Commission.

In a supplement to the Michaelmas programme of the University of Greifswald Dr. H. Ulmann makes a critical investigation into the credibility of the memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski, summing up in their favor, and examines the plans of Alexander I. respecting Poland, especially in 1805.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals : W. Miller, *Bosnia before the Turkish Conquest* (English Historical Review, October) ; E. Rodoca-

nachi, *Les Iles Ioniennes sous la Domination Russe et sous la Domination Française, 1799-1814* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1898, 4).

AMERICA.

The Old South Lectures last summer related chiefly to the non-English elements which in early days entered into the making of the American Republic. The leaflets issued in connection with these lectures presented the account of the founding of St. Augustine, by Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales; Amerigo Vespucci's account of his third voyage; Champlain's account of the founding of Quebec; Barlowe's account of the first voyage to Roanoke; Parker's account of the settlement of Londonderry, N. H., by the Scotch-Irish; Juet's account of the discovery of the Hudson River; Pastorius's description of Pennsylvania, 1700; and Acrelius's account of the founding of New Sweden.

In the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of April 27, 1898, Senator Hoar prints an interesting account of the fête which Joseph Bonaparte gave after the signing of the treaty of Fontainebleau, with interesting glimpses of the First Consul, derived from the papers of William Vans Murray. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin has a paper on the Armenian Massacres.

The burning of a printing house in Dublin, Ireland, on October 12, caused the destruction of the plates and sheets of a new work by the Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, entitled *A History of the Irish in the United States down to the present Time*. Fortunately the author had proofs of his work, which is therefore likely to be issued before very long.

Mr. Fred. W. Lucas has made a new and elaborate examination of the story of the Zeni brothers, in the light of new materials which have been made accessible since Major's book was published in 1873. His results are published (London, Henry Stevens Son and Stiles) in a sumptuous volume entitled *The Annals of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolò and Antonio Zeno in the North Atlantic about the end of the Fourteenth Century and the Claim founded thereon to a Venetian Discovery of America*. The edition is limited to 400 copies. The book will have 234 pages of letter-press, eighteen full-plate maps, and as many more in the text. Mr. Lucas's conclusions are adverse to the credit of the younger Zeno's account.

Of considerable interest and importance to students of early American history is the inaugural lecture with which Professor Luigi Hugues opened his geographical course at Turin in January, and which has now been printed, *Le Vicende del Nome America* (Torino, Loescher).

Mr. Edwin V. Morgan, now at work on a history of the diplomatic service of the United States, desires the loan of documents and letters bearing on this subject. He proposes to publish a complete list of all individuals who have at any time been employed in any diplomatic capacity, and would be obliged especially for the names and addresses of

any persons, or the descendants of any persons who have served, with or without official nomination, as attachés to legations, or as private secretaries (with diplomatic rank) to a diplomatic representative—since the names of these do not appear in the *Official Register*. Address Aurora, Cayuga Lake, N. Y., or Cascadilla Building, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Messrs. George Barrie and Son intend to issue in twenty-five parts of sixteen pages each a history of the army and navy of the United States, illustrated by 300 pictures in the text and fifty full-plate photogravures of the uniforms worn by soldiers and sailors and of ships famous in the American service. The work has the aid and official approval of the United States government. The supplement will contain more than 200,000 names of all officers in active service from 1775 to the present time.

Mr. Charles Henry Hart brings out, in a limited edition of 400 copies (Doubleday-McClure Co.), a handsome illustrated work on *Browere's Life Masks of Great Americans*, discovered by him. The book will be printed by DeVinne, and will contain reproductions of the most important of the masks.

Professor James A. Woodburn, of the Indiana University, has selected from Mr. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* the chapters and passages relating to America, has arranged and edited them with historical and bibliographical notes, and has issued the book for school use through Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. with the title *The American Revolution*.

Mr. Paul Leicester Ford is about to bring out through Messrs. Dodd, Mead and Company an edition of Mason L. Weems's *Life of Washington*, with annotations and bibliographical apparatus, in similar form to that of his book on the *New England Primer*.

The Century Company has brought out a new edition of Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, the translation by Reeve edited by Bowen, to which they have prefixed an introduction by President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University, contributing some interesting biographical matter and other details adapted to promote the understanding of Tocqueville's book in its relation to the times in which it was written.

Mr. William M. Meigs is engaged upon a life of Senator Thomas H. Benton and will be greatly obliged to any person who possesses letters of Benton if he may have the opportunity of borrowing and copying them. His address is 216 South Third Street, Philadelphia.

Mr. Henry F. Brownson of Detroit is at once author and publisher of a partial biography of his father, *Orestes A. Brownson's Early Life, from 1803 to 1844*.

The eighth volume of Mr. James D. Richardson's *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (Washington, the Government Printing Office, pp. 852) covers the eight years from March

4, 1881, to March 4, 1889. The plan differs nowise from that of the preceding volumes. The demand for the *Compilation* exceeds what was expected; an arrangement has been made whereby copies can be bought, the plates being used for a much larger edition than that originally provided for congressional distribution.

Professor Carl C. Plehn of the University of California has reprinted from the University Chronicle, in a clear and interesting pamphlet of 45 pages, three lectures on the *Finances of the United States in the Spanish War*. They can apparently be obtained from the University.

Mr. John Noble, clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, has for some time been engaged in superintending the important work of arranging and indexing the papers preserved in the clerk's office. The collection consists of some 500,000 papers bound up in about 1200 large volumes. It comprises pleadings, exhibits, depositions, copies of records, deeds, wills, correspondence and miscellaneous papers, and illustrates historical, genealogical, topographical, and antiquarian matters throughout the period from 1629 to 1800. A part of the collection, chiefly the latter part, retains its original file arrangement, but about a half was in confusion. The work of arrangement and indexing was begun fifteen years ago and is still going on. An extensive account of the work and of the papers will shortly be published in the *Transactions* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

The selections from the letter-book of John Hancock which ran for some time in the *Boston Transcript* have now been gathered into a book by Mr. Abram English Brown. It is entitled *John Hancock, His Book*, contains much biographical and explanatory matter by the editor, and is published by Lee and Shepard (286 pp.).

The late Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull bequeathed to the American Antiquarian Society the manuscript, nearly completed, of a dictionary of the language of the Massachusetts Indians. The Society has made arrangements with the United States Bureau of Ethnology whereby the dictionary shall be printed under the editorial care of Mr. Albert S. Gatschet of that bureau. Dr. Trumbull's well-known scholarship in the Indian languages will doubtless make the book a standard.

The October number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society contains an article by the Hon. Amos Perry on early commercial signs in Providence and one by Hon. A. B. Gardiner on the Havana expedition of 1762. It has also a list of the vessels belonging to the port of Providence in 1791, with their tonnage.

Mr. William Nelson, chairman of the Public Records Commission of New Jersey, has recently discovered the record of the proceedings of the West Jersey Assembly in 1682. The Commission have employed Mr. Berthold Fernow to make a calendar of the early records in the office of the Secretary of State at Trenton. Those of East Jersey and West Jersey anterior to their union are nearly completed. It is hoped that the cal-

endar will be printed in the *New Jersey Archives*: Vol. XX. of that series, containing newspaper extracts relating to New Jersey, 1756-1761, and a history of New Jersey printers and printing prior to 1800, is nearly through the press. Vol. XXI. of the same series will contain an index to the marriage bonds in the office of the Secretary of State at Trenton and indexes to the marriage records of several counties prior to 1801. This volume also is nearly printed.

A letter of Benjamin Rush, printed in the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for November, proves that the articles signed "Scaevola" and "Hampden," in Bradford's *Pennsylvania Journal* for October 13 and 20, 1773, were written, the former by Mifflin, the latter by Rush.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* contains an interesting investigation of the origin of the Council of Censors and of its history in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790, by Mr. L. H. Meader; a body of extracts from the journal of one who surveyed land in northeastern Pennsylvania in 1797; and the conclusion of Mr. Howard M. Jenkins's account of the family of William Penn, which last is to appear before long in book-form.

Several matters of interest are presented in the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History*: a series of early wills from Isle of Wight County; an interesting letter of Richard Bland on Virginian affairs in 1771 (but surely much lack of editing is shown when in a Virginian magazine the name of Rev. Mr. Horrocks is constantly spelled Howocks); a vindication of Sir William Berkeley, and a poll of Frederick County at the election of 1758, when Col. George Washington was chosen to the House of Burgesses. Mr. Alexander Brown's *First Republic in America* is reviewed at length by Mr. William Wirt Henry.

The latest issue in the series of *Johns Hopkins University Studies* is a monograph by Professor E. W. Sikes on The Transition of North Carolina from Colony to Commonwealth.

In 1844 the Historical Society of the University of North Carolina was organized by Governor Swain and others. But neither that association nor the North Carolina Historical Society, (if that was a different body, of which we are not sure), has maintained an active existence for some years past. On April 20, 1893, the North Carolina Historical Society was re-organized, at a meeting held at Charlotte. Dr. Dred Peacock of Greensborough was made president, and Mr. E. H. Bean of Charlotte secretary and treasurer.

The *Charleston Year-Book* for 1897 contains, as is usual, a historical appendix, by Hon. William A. Courtenay. It consists of a body of material, from uncommon books or from original manuscripts, relating to the history of the siege of Charleston in 1780: a history of St. Mary's Church (Catholic) by its rector, Dr. Thomas F. Hopkins; and extracts from the history of Easton, Mass., relating to the missionary expedition to South Carolina in 1695.

Rev. Dr. A. M. Chreitzberg has prepared an extensive and careful account of the early history of Methodism within the limits of the old South Carolina Conference, whose territory was South Carolina, with certain parts of North Carolina and Georgia. The book has been written at the invitation of the present conference and, under the title *Early Methodism in the Carolinas* (pp. xiv, 364), has been published by the Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

A *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Alabama*, by Rev. Walter C. Whitaker, rector of Christ Church, Tuscaloosa, extending from 1763 to 1891, has been published at Birmingham by Roberts and Son.

Dominique Rouquette's manuscript history of the Choctaws, a work of much value and interest, which had been supposed to have been destroyed by fire, has been lately deposited in the Howard Memorial Library at New Orleans.

In the October number of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* the most important article is one by Mr. John C. Townes on the Development of the Judicial System of Texas, in which the subject of his former article is continued from the year 1845 down. An article by the late Judge Roberts, unfinished, deals with the Capitals of Texas. The same subject is really the chief theme of Judge C. W. Raines's second article on "The Enduring Laws of the Republic of Texas."

The next publication of the Caxton Club of Chicago will be the *Relation of Henri de Tonty concerning the Explorations of La Salle from 1678 to 1683*, translated by Mr. Melville B. Anderson.

The *Annals of Iowa* for October is mainly occupied with a series of articles on the Spirit Lake Expedition of 1857.

The Historical Department of Iowa has printed, under the editorial care of Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, the *First Census of the Original Counties of Dubuque and Des Moines taken in July, 1836*.

The Duc de Loubat has caused the Borgia Codex, a Mexican ritual manuscript belonging to the Propaganda, to be reproduced in chromo-photography under the supervision of the Vatican Library. The volume is entitled *Il Manoscritto Messicano della S. Congregazione di Propaganda Fede riprodotto*, etc.

In the most recent annual report of the Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht Mr. George Edmundson publishes General William Byam's report of the conquest of Paramaribo in 1665; Mr. Kernkamp prints some documents relating to the history of the Noord-Compagnie.

Messrs. Hume and Company of Santiago de Chile have republished from Vol. 97 of the *Anales de la Universidad de Chile* the *Bibliografía Española de las Islas Filipinas, 1523-1810* (524 pages) by Señor J. T. Medina. The bibliography contains 667 titles and is fully indexed.

The early expeditions of the Dutch against the Philippines are chronicled by Mr. Sloos in an Amsterdam thesis, *De Nederlanders in de Philipijnsche Wateren vóór 1626*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Beauvois, *La Contrefaçon du Christianisme chez les Mexicains du Moyen Age* (Le Muséon, 1898, 3-4); H. de Charencey, *Le Historien Sahagun et les Migrations Mexicaines* (*ibid.*); W. G. Sumner, *The Coin Shilling of Massachusetts Bay*, I. (Yale Review, November); R. R. Elliott, *The Recollets at Detroit during the Eighteenth Century* (American Catholic Quarterly, October); A. M. Davis, *A Connecticut Land-Bank of the Eighteenth Century* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, October); *Loyalists of the American Revolution* (Quarterly Review, October); P. L. Ford, *The Many-Sided Franklin* (Century, November); L. Vignols, *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises avant 1789* (Revue de Géographie, September); R. P. Falkner, *The Development of the Census* (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November); L. Sciout, *La Révolution à Saint Domingue: Les Commissaires Sonthonax et Polverel* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); L. G. Bugbee, *Slavery in Early Texas*, I. (Political Science Quarterly, September); R. D. Hunt, *The Legal Status of California, 1846-1849* (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November); D. S. Jordan, *Colonial Lessons of Alaska* (Atlantic, November); G. H. Haynes, *Qualifications for the Suffrage* (Political Science Quarterly, September); J. F. Crowell, *Railway Receiverships in the United States, their Origin and Development* (Yale Review, November).